FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-124
Tuesday
28 June 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-124 *28 June 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Maj Gen Tenin Urges Realism in Arms Policy *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* 1
Historian Views Ways to 'Genuine Security' *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 2
Military Expert Comments on Strategic Balance *[Slipchenko in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]* 3
Further Reportage on UN Disarmament Session 4
- Shevardnadze Letter Issued 4
- Delegation Gives Briefing 5
- Petrovskiy Speech Outlined 5
- Petrovskiy Reviews Session 5
- Petrovskiy Assesses Talks 6

Gerasimov on INF Treaty Inspection Procedures 6
Military Officer Views Conventional Disarmament *[Vienna KURIER 25 Jun]* 7
Disarmament Talks Continue in Vienna 7

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Session To Open in Prague 5 Jul 8
Pact Defense Ministers To Meet Early Jul 8
Tashkent Meeting Discusses Drug Problem *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 8

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Oganov Ponders Theses' Foreign Policy Statement *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 23 Jun]* 10
NATO Decision on Force for Norway Deplored *[Korshunov]* 11
Demichev Speaks at Nuclear-Free Zones Meeting *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 12
- Babenko Views Conference 15

CEMA Secretary Sychev Interviewed on EEC Ties *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 16
Grigoryev on Party Conference, 'Big Seven' *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 18
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[Vedenyapin, Andrianov, Volskiy]* 19

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Spokesman Scores VOA Charges on Afghanistan *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 25
Canada Expulsions 'Unprovoked Insult' *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 25

China

PRC Premier Li Cited on Peace Prospects *[PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 26
Restructuring Breaks Decade of Stagnation *[Beijing XINHUA]* 26
Nie Dajiang Leads Radio, Television Delegation 27
- Group Tours Tashkent 27
- Protocol Signed 27

Further on PRC Youth Federation's Visit 27
- Talk With Chelnokov 27
- Youth Leader on Gromyko Meeting 27

Vedernikov Receives Metallurgists Delegation *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 28
Trade Union Leader Interviewed on Reforms 28
Shirayev Eyes Light Industry's 'Bright Future' 28
Assembly of People's Representatives Opens 29

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for Cambodian Settlement Viewed *[Vinogradov in IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 29
SRV Premier Do Muoi Congratulated *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 30
Vietnamese Communist Party Plenum Reported *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 30
Australia's Hawke Condemns U.S. Trade Policy 30

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Pessimism on Future, Party Unity Viewed
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 23 Jun] 31
Afghan Rebels Suffer 'Major Failure' *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 32
U.S., Other 'Advisers' Infiltrate Afghanistan 32
CIA Efforts Against Afghanistan Outlined 33
Afghans Pass 34th Note to UN Observer Group 34
'Senior Officials' Discuss Post-Summit Mideast *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* 34

Sub-Saharan Africa

Quadripartite Talks on Southern Africa Held 34
Second Round Welcomed *[Tarutin in PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 34
Talks Open in Cairo 35
Current Round Ends *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 35
'Some Progress' at Talks 35
Commentary Views Results 36

Latin America & Caribbean

Haitian Communist Comments on Namphy Coup *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* 36
Recent Developments in Haiti Observed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 37
Reconciliation Commission Meets in Managua 37
Nicaragua Minister Condemns Honduran Stand 37
Nicaraguan Government Urges Resumption of Talks 38
Cooperation Program Signed With Nicaragua 38
Assembly Meeting in Panama Reported 38

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

19th CPSU Conference

Reportage on Conference Opening Activities 39
Gorbachev, Others Register 39
Yakovlev To Hold News Conference 39
TASS Describes Opening 39
Gorbachev Opening Remarks 40
Ligachev Address at Opening 40
Leadership Lineup Noted 41
Paper Frontpages Lenin Prior to Conference *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 41
Conference Must Move Country 'Only Forward' *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 42
Latsis Discusses Party, Economic Reform 43
More on Latsis, Afanasyev Remarks *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 44
News Conference on Glasnost 46
No 'Fundamental' Differences *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Jun]* 48
Press Center Head Sklyarov on Conference Work 49

Political & Social

More Demonstrations Occur in Nagorno-Karabakh 50
Stepanakert 27 Jun Report *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 50
NKAO Soviet Resolution *[Yerevan]* 50

Tatar Protesters Arrested in Tashkent, Moscow 50
900 Barred From Moscow *[AFP]* 50
Gorbachev Against Changes *[AFP]* 51
Tajik, Uzbek Leaders View Interethnic Ties *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 51
Estonia's Ryuytel on Justice for Stalin's Victims 52
Kolbin, Suleymenov Discuss Changes in Kazakhstan *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 52
Yevtushenko Hails Non-Party 'People's Front' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 24]* 55
Sakhalin Officials' Malfeasance Concealed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 58
Local Party Leaders Reprimanded for Censorship *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 22 Jun]* 60
Officials Discuss Restructuring on TV Programs 60
'Roads of Restructuring' 60
'Problems, Solutions' Program 62
Sklyarov, Others in Roundtable 66
Readers Criticize Response to Glasnost *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 14 Jun]* 72
Sociologists Survey Restructuring Process *[SOTIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Jun]* 73
Ligachev Visits Construction Materials Combine 76
Talyzin Chairs Conference on Youth Labor Squads
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Jun] 76

Economic

Abalkin Comments on Party Conference Theses 76
Academy Official on Status of Economic Reform *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 25]* 77

Agricultural

Kazakhstan Cancels Irrigation Projects 80
Further on Nikonov, Zaykov Meeting on Produce *[PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 81
Ligachev, Nikonov Attend Goods Exhibition 81
Nikonov Speaks at Agro-Industrial Committee 81
Further on Report to Collegium 82

Scientific

Coordinates for Rocket Launches Announced 82
Soviet, Bulgarian Cosmonauts Presented Awards 82
Gromyko Gives Awards 82
Demichev in Attendance 83
Gromyko Speaks 83
Analyst Reviews U.S.-USSR Space Cooperation 83
Activities Aboard 'Mir' Complex Reported 84
Dispute Between Leningrad, Academy Scientists 84
New Cargo Delivery System to Arctic Developed 84
Baklanov Views Developments in Aviation *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 85

Military

Yazov Remarks to Conference Delegates Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 85
Stalin's 'Gross' Wartime Errors Detailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Jun]* 85

Maj Gen Tenin Urges Realism in Arms Policy

PM2806090988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Major General V. Tenin, candidate of military sciences: "Egotism or Realism?"]

[Text] The new political thinking has enabled the Soviet Union to put forward a number of major international ideas aimed at producing a decisive shift away from confrontation, tension, militarism, and strong-arm methods in state relations and toward cooperation, trust, disarmament, and political dialogue.

These include ideas relating to security and the prevention of war: a program for phased elimination of nuclear weapons in the world, an all-embracing security system, defense sufficiency, a nonoffensive doctrine, a balance of interests, and the strengthening of national and regional security by lowering the level of armaments. These have all made the world sit up, setting sociopolitical forces in motion at the tricky crossroads where the world stands today.

The world community has approached this crossroads under a global threat to mankind's very existence. Never before has a civilization developed such rapid rates of development while simultaneously accumulating weapons for its own destruction at the very same rate.

Some 55,000 nuclear munitions, equivalent to more than 15,000 megatonnes of TNT altogether, almost 4 tonnes of nuclear explosive for every inhabitant of the earth, is the appalling balance of world stocks of nuclear weapons, according to UN figures. Were it to be used, not only would everything that lives and breathes perish, but the earth would be torn asunder. The conventional arms arsenals are an equally heavy burden. Their use brings an hourly death toll in regional conflicts and local wars. These weapons are being improved, acquiring the lethal characteristics of nuclear ones. The arithmetic of slaughter is turning into the algebra of universal self-destruction.

On entering the nuclear, missile, space, and electronics age, the human race not only hauled the trappings of war with it but also a host of archaic dogmas to justify it. However, mankind does not stand at the crossroads with negative baggage alone. An enormous potential for coexistence, cooperation, and the political solution of acute problems has been built up.

Only now have we really taken our bearings and asked the question: What path will we choose in the future—the path of egotistically setting off national interests against one another or realistic collaboration based on a balance of such interests?

In the first event, we will understandably see no light on the horizon, as the strong will crush the weak and military methods of solving the world's problems will remain paramount. The arms race will assume ever more sophisticated forms and could become irreversible. Striving for parity and parity itself in the military sphere will no longer be capable of playing the role of a stabilizing factor. The situation could get out of hand at any time. As a whole, this will be a move toward catastrophe—nuclear, economic, and environmental.

In the second event, the picture of the world' development looks quite different. The main thing is that striving for a balance of interests must not only be accompanied but also be ensured by a continuous process of disarmament and growth in mutual trust. The task of preventing war and violence thus comes to the forefront of international politics. The balance of forces is supplanted by a balance of interests, which results from account being taken of one's own national interests and the legitimate interests of one's international community partners when resolving questions of world politics, however complex they may be.

The positive nature of this result resides in its being achieved by purely peaceful means. For some people, this may also have a minus sign, since the concept of a balance of interests does not mean stopping rivalry or competition stemming from the ideological and socioeconomic differences of states.

It is important that military strength give way to political reason in the balance of interests, the kind of reason which makes it possible for all countries—large or small, armed or neutral, united in blocs or nonaligned—to hold dialogue.

Pluralism of political choice must be guaranteed by freedom of choice and its respect by other countries. That means that no matter how countries view one another, relations between them in the outside world can be based only on civilized principles of peaceful coexistence. This means more than getting used to another system of views or ideology. They can be diametrically opposed, but that is no reason for ideological disputes to be transferred into the sphere of interstate relations. They must be pure if contacts are to be expanded, confidence built, and spheres of parallel and joint interests developed.

This is perhaps a less than exhaustive outline of the new foreign policy philosophy, which predetermines a future unmarred by nuclear madness.

Three years ago, the policy of realism geared toward a balance of interests was only grasping after this outcome. However, in 1986, the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries had already proposed two major programs for strengthening world security on this basis: a phased plan for the complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000 and the Budapest program of considerable cuts in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Today, after the Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow, held against the backdrop of the

ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the implementation of the Geneva agreements on a political settlement surrounding Afghanistan, and positive features in the drafting in Vienna of a mandate for major talks on European disarmament, it is possible to talk about the first practical results of world politics based on a balance of interests. The agreements in the sphere of disarmament will make it possible to reduce and in a number of cases completely eliminate a particular kind of weapon which forms the material base of war, that is to say, the instruments of pressure and threats which form the nub of the outmoded policy of a balance of forces.

But not everything is so simple in this dialectically complex and contradictory world. The arms race as a manifestation of human activity has its own catechism. Aggressive militarism does not come about in a vacuum. History shows that it is an accurate reflection of the inner disposition of the ruling circles of a particular state to achieve the monopoly right if not to direct the processes in the world at least to influence them, based on its own ideas about the role and place of other countries in it. Force—military, political, and economic—supplies the argument for such "influence." The method: diktat and intimidation; the means: an arms race designed to exhaust the rival and to attain a position of military-strategic superiority.

The fact that all this is present in the policy of the major NATO countries, despite certain positive aspects (could there otherwise have been, for example, the "double zero" on nuclear missiles in Europe, the achievement of East-West dialogue on conventional arms, or the breakthrough in Soviet-American relations), forces the USSR and the Warsaw Pact to tackle a dual task in the foreign policy sphere.

First, actively promoting the process of talks in the sphere of disarmament and security. It is indicative that at the UN General Assembly third special session on disarmament, our plans in this sphere were supplemented by a broad range of measures to decrease the naval threat. As of today, the Warsaw Pact countries have in conjunction offered the world community an integrated concept of demilitarization on land, at sea, and in the air and outer space.

Second, not slackening the attention paid to the building of defense, the efficiency of which, as the CPSU Central Committee Theses stress, must henceforth be ensured predominantly by qualitative parameters in regard to both equipment and personnel.

From the historic crossroads from which mankind is about to stride into the future, the following picture is discernible: The countries and the peoples, irrespective of their social choice, are building their relations on the basis of disarmament, a balance of interests, and all-around cooperation. When this picture will become reality rather than just an image depends on how dynamically world politics restructures itself on the basis of the new thinking.

Historian Views Ways to 'Genuine Security'

PM2706155188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences L. Semeyko: "Guidelines for Genuine Security"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Above all, we must strive with the help of collective efforts to ensure that security is safeguarded by non-nuclear means. This, of course, would accord with common interests. But it is important to take account of the specific features of the time. In the past, wars broke out even when certain common interests were present. But now the main thing is to take account of an interest which mankind has never had before: ensuring its own survival. For the sake of resolving this paramount task, we not only can but must embark on serious compromises, radically revising our attitude toward ways of safeguarding our own security. We must do this not unilaterally but jointly, using political measures. At a time when even a minimum number of nuclear arsenals is liable to destroy both us and the Americans and wipe out all life on earth, we cannot continue to be concerned about our own and only our own security by infringing upon the other side's security. The security mechanism cannot operate on the hourglass principle. Maintaining security is not a no-stakes game where if one side wins, the other side loses. Only both sides can win or lose. In order to win, we need a new international mechanism and new approaches.

Unfortunately, by no means did we realize this immediately. We allowed ourselves to be drawn into the arms race when we were striving—without heeding the cost or the political losses at certain stages—to achieve strategic parity at all costs. I think that if one assesses it properly, we overestimated the importance of the quantitative factor of parity, whereas its main feature is the qualitative side—the ability of a strategic potential to inflict a crushing retaliatory strike. As a result, we invested not so much in equal security as in equal insecurity—for that is what characterizes the present nuclear confrontation.

We are now doing an abrupt turnaround and calling for the other nuclear powers to show sense. Once bitten, twice shy, as the saying goes: In ensuring non-nuclear security, we must be hypercautious about conventional arms. We must not allow the intensification of "conventional" confrontation to threaten mankind in the same way as the retention of nuclear confrontation. The shape of conventional weapons arsenals of enhanced destructive power and directed-energy weapons are already

visible today, not to mention the threat of new generations and types of mass destruction weaponry. We must not step onto the dangerous bridge that will take us out of the frying pan into the fire.

The defensive sufficiency of the military potentials of the USSR and the United States and a nonoffensive doctrine—these are the "military" keys to ensuring nonnuclear security. Having sufficient for defense but insufficient for attack is a very simple idea that, however, requires a truly gigantic restructuring of armed forces structures, of the system of philosophical, doctrinal, and strategic views, and of the military-political thinking not only of politicians but of the military—and particularly, I think, the military, who are traditionally raised in an offensive spirit, even if not for aggressive actions.

The psychology of such a restructuring will require that everyone stand above their own national egoism, take account of the balance of interests, and comprehend the opposing side's fears so as to dispel them. We must learn to distinguish a perceived threat from a real one so as to prevent an "overreaction" in countermeasures. We must recognize the paramount importance not of military but of nonmilitary, political security guarantees. Without this, everything will remain the same: a never-ending arms race "for the sake of security," but to all intents and purposes for the sake of preventing mankind's survival.

There is no disputing the fact that the idea of universal security through disarmament has not yet been made completely specific; it is still undefined in a number of areas. The Soviet objections aired at the UN General Assembly third special session on disarmament, of course, do not represent the ultimate truth—they merely outline the most acute problems and possible ways of solving them. But it is all the more important to add to and develop the idea—both conceptually and practically—through joint efforts. At the special session, the Soviet Union made such a weighty and, in terms of its ideas, revolutionary contribution that it simply cannot be overestimated. The Soviet concept appeals both to reason and to the feelings of the representatives of the world community, marking a break with obsolete stereotypes and standards in our foreign policy and a move toward its humanist foundations. The Soviet proposals submitted at the special sessions are intended to implement the foreign policy provisions of both the 27th CPSU Congress and the Theses for the party conference, and to put into practice a number of ideas expressed by the Soviet side at the Moscow summit; they take account of the positions of other representatives of the world community. Therein lies their dynamism and strength.

Military Expert Comments on Strategic Balance

PM2706161588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jun 88 First Edition p 3

[First of two-part article by Doctor of Military Sciences Colonel V. Slipchenko: "Strategic Balance"]

[Text] 1. Destabilizing Factors [subhead]

The Soviet-U.S. Moscow summit meeting remains at the center of the attention of statesmen, politicians, and representatives of the world public. People throughout the world regard it as a major event which once again showed the significance of and need for a stable and ongoing Soviet-U.S. dialogue, a dialogue which embraces the most burning problems of concern to not only the Soviet and U.S. peoples but also the peoples of all countries. This is particularly important in our nuclear age, when a mistake in major world politics could have fatal consequences.

Documents which record what has been achieved in Soviet-U.S. relations and define guidelines for the future were signed in Moscow. Among them the exchange of instruments of ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-and Shorter-Range Missiles is of special significance. The epoch of real nuclear disarmament has thus begun.

However, it has not yet been possible to draw up and conclude a still more important treaty—on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms—which, as the joint top-level statement in Moscow acknowledges, "will help strengthen strategic stability and the security of not only the Soviet and U.S. peoples but also all mankind." The U.S. SDI program is a major obstacle in the way of the treaty.

"It does not fit in with normal logic," M.S. Gorbachev declared at the 1 June news conference, "to cut back strategic offensive arms on the earth and build a bridge into space for an arms race. The U.S. side tries to convince us that these are just defensive weapons.

"We do not believe so. And we are competent to express this view. If the arms race is transferred into space, this is fraught with a very serious destabilization of the whole world situation."

The realization of the SDI program could lead to disruption of the existing Soviet-U.S. strategic balance, which, by virtue of the catastrophic consequences of an inevitable counterstrike, deters the aggressor from using strategic offensive arms to achieve his political and strategic aims.

As long as the sides' potential for causing irreparable harm in a counterstrike remains the most important condition of strategic balance, the world will be kept under conditions of a "balance of fear." However, this in no way means that nuclear weapons are some kind of "guarantee of peace" and make it possible to avoid a world war. Yet it is precisely this flawed principle that is followed by those people in the United States (as well as, incidentally, its NATO allies) who determine military policy. Factors arise on this basis which threaten to destabilize the strategic balance.

Such a factor should be considered the desire of one of the sides to create [sozdat] a fundamentally new, highly effective ABM defense system on a strategic scale which would be capable of, if not repulsing, then considerably weakening an enemy counterstrike and reducing its own losses to an acceptable level. One side will be forced to respond to the development [razvitiye] of ABM defensive arms by the other side by taking necessary measures to ensure the possibility of a timely and guaranteed strike against the potential aggressor's vital targets so as to cause him irreparable damage. Balance can also be achieved in this way. But it would be at a far higher level and, consequently, less stable. The continuation of the strategic offensive and defensive arms race will inevitably increase the danger of war and could raise it to levels where even balance will cease to be a factor of military-political deterrence.

The facts indicate that certain influential circles in the United States are not abandoning their attempts to upset the stability of the existing military-strategic balance, both by building up the potential for inflicting a "disarming" strike and by creating [sozdaniye] means to repulse (neutralize) a nuclear missile counterstrike. The "comprehensive strategic program" remains in force, providing for 100 MX ICBM's to be added to the arsenal, as well as 1,000 highly accurate Midgetman mobile ICBM's by 1996. The Trident-2 SLBM will become the Navy's chief strategic weapon in the nineties, and there will be 480 of them on board 20 nuclear-powered submarines. B-52 aircraft with cruise missiles (194 bombers) will remain in strategic aviation. New B-1B aircraft (100 of them) are already being added to the arsenal. Production of ATB bombers (132 of them) is being prepared. All these aircraft are capable of carrying thousands of cruise missiles. Thus by 1996, the U.S. strategic offensive forces will be capable of using 16,000-19,000 nuclear charges simultaneously in a first strike.

The policy adopted by Washington of creating [sozdaniye] strategic defensive forces is also an extremely dangerous destabilizing factor. The SDI program provides for the deployment of a large-scale multiechelon ABM system with space-based elements. The directors of this program are in a hurry to switch from research work to practical results. They are in a hurry in order to tie the next administration's hands and rule out the possibility of its abandoning this dangerous venture. They are also in a hurry because manifest opposition to the SDI program is growing in the U.S. Congress. This present haste reflects the desire of the creators of the "Star Wars" plans to more quickly face the world with the fact of the irreversibility of the processes in the creation [sozdaniye] of strategic defensive weapons.

It is important to bear in mind that one of the chief aims of the SDI program is to ensure the possibility and the highly effective nature of a nuclear first strike, which would also be made directly from space. A whole range of weapons is being developed [razrabatyvat] on new physical principles within the framework of the SDI program: nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers, microwave weapons, ultra high-speed cluster shells, optical and laser bombs, nuclear devices producing an enhanced electromagnetic pulse, gamma radiation munitions, and others. Attempts are being made to create [sozdat] a third generation of strategic nuclear weapons which will not be comparable with weapons of the first two generations—atomic and thermonuclear—in terms of destructive force and the surprise factor. Directed-energy space strike weapons ("Star Wars" weapons), which are to be capable of instantly wiping out whole areas of the earth, are being developed [razrabatyvat].

"The Strategic Defense Initiative," R. Bowman, president of the American Institute for Space and Security Studies, emphasizes, "bears no relation to U.S. defense. The only likely use of arms of the 'Star Wars' program is use by an aggressor for defense after he has inflicted a first nuclear strike." In this connection, observers also draw attention to the fact that Washington stubbornly refuses to adopt a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, although the USSR and the PRC have already adopted such a pledge.

The SDI program graphically illustrates the contradictory nature of the U.S. position. On the one hand, people there admit that war between our countries is inadmissible and must not happen and are conducting arms reduction talks with the USSR. On the other hand, the gamble on force as the chief principle of U.S. policy with regard to our country and also other countries is constantly proclaimed at a high official level. This can be observed now, after the Moscow summit meeting. The SDI program was basically conceived as a means of outdistancing us by way of space and securing the military advantage—which the Soviet Union cannot permit.

Further Reportage on UN Disarmament Session

Shevardnadze Letter Issued

LD2306101688 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 22 TASS—The text of the letter by Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, on the issue of openness and glasnost in international relations has been issued here today as an official document of the third special session on disarmament of the U.N. General Assembly.

The letter stresses among other things that in the USSR's opinion the time is ripe to start within the U.N. framework developing objective criteria and parameters to ensure openness with the aim of contributing towards the process of real disarmament. The implementation within the U.N. framework of the measures of openness and glasnost would enhance its potential in maintaining international peace and security, lay the groundwork for building a system of international relations free from mutual fears and suspicions.

Delegation Gives Briefing

LD2506012088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Members and experts of the Soviet delegation at the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament have held a briefing for journalists. The Soviet experts discussed the final stage in the drawing up of the special session's final document. It was noted that during this session a positive approach is being demonstrated to multilateral disarmament matters.

At the same time, there are differences in the stances of certain countries on a number of problems, particularly on the matter of a total ban on nuclear tests.

Petrovskiy Speech Outlined

LD2606210388 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 26 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 26 TASS—This special session will occupy a very conspicuous place in the history of the United Nations Organization, Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said today in a speech to the closing plenary meeting of the U.N. General Assembly's third special session on disarmament.

The session [words indistinct] the crucial [words indistinct] the start of a real process of nuclear disarmament and became a truly people's assembly of representatives of various public and non-governmental organizations and the generator of new [word indistinct] and proposals the implementation of which will make it possible to fill [word indistinct] with a tangible content and to set into motion mechanisms of disarmament. The (?debate) has shown that the idea of the new political thinking which presupposes renunciation of confrontation and countervailing use force, and parallel constructivism of bilateral and multilateral efforts of countries are beginning to be widely introduced to the practice of world politics".

"Really, the logic of security in the military sphere has become [word indistinct] with new content at the session. The culture of the dialogue has changed too. It ceases to be a verbal fencing and a [word indistinct] for victory over an opponent but becomes the source of the quest for ideas and the source of the truth".

"Of course, revitalisation of U.N. activities, just as everything new, encounters opposition on the part of the braking forces of conservative reaction", the representative of the USSR pointed out. "We witnessed that at this special session as well. It is regrettable that a final document has not been coordinated precisely owing to counteraction by those forces. The more so as consensus was within reach, so to speak, and the Soviet delegation was ready to act so that consensus could be reached on all points of the document".

"Nevertheless what has happened does not discourage us", Vladimir Petrovskiy went on to say. "The session, having become a sort of laboratory of the new thinking, now creates greater opportunities for its rich potential to be used in practical acts and at other forums and to serve further headway in all direction of disarmament. The Soviet Union has received at the session a powerful store of energy for acting in all directions of disarmament. We are gratified to point out that our priorities are shared by the international community".

"The priorities are to conclude an agreement on a 50-per cent reduction in the strategic offensive arms of the Soviet Union and the United States with the observance of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, to ban the tests of nuclear weapons, to cut down conventional arms and the armed forces and, as a starter, to hold talks on these issues in application to the European Continent from the Atlantic to the Urals, and finally to introduce the mechanisms of verification, openness and trust to the process of disarmament. Our routes of disarmament are a mutli-lane highway where there is room for both bilateral and multilateral efforts".

"We hold that in present day conditions it is exceptionally important that bilateral processes be substantiated by multilateral efforts and that there should be mutual enrichment from the experience gained as a result of acting in these two directions. We intend to continue to rely on the experience and wisdom of the international community and the knowledge which we have gained at this special session", the deputy minister of the foreign affairs of the USSR emphasized in conclusion.

Petrovskiy Reviews Session

LD2606180188 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 26 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 26 TASS—Today the 3rd special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament ended its work at the U.N. Headquarters.

Saying final remarks, Peter Florin, president of the special session, expressed regret that delegates had not been able to reach consensus and to draft a final document. Nevertheless, the debate at the session was distinguished for diverse discussion of problems of limiting the arms race and of disarmament. It clearly showed rapprochement in positions of states on the main issues of disarmament and international security. Useful was also an open and thorough dialogue on questions with respect to which differences in positions persist.

The president of the special session pointed to the intensity of the debate at the session of problems of nuclear disarmament, complete discontinuation of nuclear arms tests and nuclear non-proliferation. Much importance was attached to the earliest drafting of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Of no less importance was an exchange of opinions on cutting conventional weapons and preventing the arms

race from spreading to outer space. The concept of nuclear-free zones also got a backing. Now, Peter Florin pointed out, it is important to step up the dialogue to achieve agreement of positions. Great readiness for a compromise is needed. Of pivotal importance in this respect is the general interest of nations in ensuring international peace and security.

"The special session became, on the whole, a very noticeable positive event in the international life," Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, told TASS. "A frank and substantive exchange of opinions on disarmament issues was held." Quite a number of new ideas were expressed both at the General Assembly and at forums of the international public held at the same time. The special session showed that the ideas of the new political thinking are becoming part of the intellectual life of states and governments. People start discussing problems of our time from these points of view. "At the same time it is very deplorable that the session could not draft a joint final document," the deputy minister said. This did not happen due to the fact that the USA was not ready to participate in a multilateral dialogue and in multilateral efforts of states. This shows how difficult for the new to open the way. In the international life, the action of forces of deceleration finds its expression now in the policy of the present U.S. Administration in international organizations.

Petrovskiy Assesses Talks

LD2706214388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Soviet delegation that took part in the work of the third special UN General Assembly session on disarmament returned to Moscow today. At the airport, our correspondent interviewed Comrade Petrovskiy, deputy head of the delegation and USSR deputy foreign minister.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Vladimir Fedorovich, what are the practical results of the session from which you have just returned?

[Petrovskiy] The third special session of the UN General Assembly that has just ended served as a thorough and nonconfrontational dialogue on the whole range of disarmament problems. It became absolutely clear during this dialogue that the Moscow summit revived the hope and confidence of states in the idea that disarmament is possible and attainable. The session showed that the priorities that the USSR has been promoting are in full harmony with the world community's frame of mind. They include a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons while observing the ABM Treaty, a ban on nuclear arms testing, the soonest possible signing of a convention on eliminating chemical weapons, and, finally, the start of talks on reducing conventional and armed [as heard] forces in Europe.

Also, the session showed that ideas of the new political thinking are being adopted by the world community on an ever-broadening scale. This is reflected in the issues that have been suggested for agendas and in the style of the discussions.

At the same time, the process of advancing the new thinking is fairly complicated. Not all states are ready yet to look jointly for common agreed documents. Therefore, it turned out thaat at the last moment the United States was not in a position to agree with the final draft document that had been elaborated in the course of unofficial consultations. So, the session ended with a statement of the General Assembly's chairman, in which its main results were summed up.

[Correspondent] Vladimir Fedorovich, what is your view of the session's results? Are they good or bad?

[Petrovskiy] I think that the results of this session are positive in the sense that a large base for further actions was created at the session. [end recording]

Gerasimov on INF Treaty Inspection Procedures

LD2606174488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Jun 88

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Reciprocal inspection in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles begins on 1 July. The Americans will go to Votkinsk in Udmurtiya and will settle in there for 13 years to observe the works there, which are bashfully called engineering works. Our inspectors [kontroler] will be based at the Hercules No 1 works in the town of Magna in the state of Utah. Given the normal secretiveness of both sides, the exchange of inspectors is a breakthrough.

There will also be spot checks—the inspectors can appear in places where there is a sign saying: Forbidden Zone, which has probably faded over many years. They can appear, let's say, in a village which disappeared from the maps some time ago, Novaya Sysoyevka. It snuggles in the hills of the Sikhote-Alin ridge in Maritime Kray. Forty-seven intermediate-range missiles are hidden there. Or the Americans will go to Polotsk, Mozyr, Slutsk, Lutsk, Chervonograd, (Vysokaya pech), Novosibirsk, Barnaul, Kansk, or Pinsk.

As we can see, glasnost is also possible in the delicate military sphere—though by mutual agreement, to be sure. Here, too, we must move further forward.

Military Officer Views Conventional Disarmament

AU2706151888 Vienna KURIER in German 25 Jun 88 p 23

[Reader's letter from "Colonel Dmitriy Belskiy—General Staff—Moscow"]

[Text] The other day, the daily KURIER found "fault" with the fact that the USSR had proposed to extend the reduction zone of conventional arms and armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals, but not merely to central Europe. However, this proposal results from the situation which had been created in Europe. It is a well-known fact that both the Warsaw Pact and NATO have substantial arsenals outside of central Europe. In terms of military potentials and technical equipment, Western military experts place England and France next to the United States. In terms of numbers, the Turkish Armed Forces come second to the United States in NATO. Thus, it would be insufficient if we were to confine ourselves to the central European area.

The Warsaw Pact has no "dramatic preponderance" of conventional arms. This has been repeatedly recognized even in the West. But there are certain imbalances and asymmetries. The Warsaw Pact, for instance, has a disproportion of some 20,000 tanks, and NATO has one of 1,400 aircraft of the air strike force [Angriffsluftwaffe]. Brought into action three times a day, 440 such aircraft can replace up to three tank divisions in terms of efficiency, mobility, and firepower. We suggest that one begin reducing conventional arms by eliminating the existing imbalances and asymmetries.

Disarmament Talks Continue in Vienna

LD2706115688 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] Vienna June 27 TASS—A regular meeting was held here today within the framework of consultations between representatives of Warsaw Treaty and NATO member states on working out a mandate for future talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

CEMA Session To Open in Prague 5 Jul

LD2406122988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] The 44th CEMA session will open in Prague on 5 July. In accordance with the accord that has been reached, the session will take place at the level of heads of government of CEMA member countries.

Pact Defense Ministers To Meet Early Jul

LD2506164288 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 25 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—The defence ministers' committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states will meet for its regular session in the first half of July in Moscow, it is officially reported here today.

Tashkent Meeting Discusses Drug Problem

PM2706150988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by special correspondents Ye. Shestinskiy and A. Kuvshinnikov under the rubric "Detailed Reports for IZVESTIYA": "Learn From One Another: Decision of Anti-Drugs Specialists at International Meeting"]

[Text] Tashkent, Moscow—The drug addiction problem exists to a varying extent in every country. One can only talk about the extent of this evil and about means and methods of combatting it. As for the socialist countries, their internal problems in this sphere are in many respects similar. That was why Bulgarian, Hungarian, Polish, CSSR, and Soviet police officers specializing in the war on drugs attended a meeting in Tashkent held under the auspices and on the initiative of the USSR MVD. This was the first professional meeting of its kind.

Fortunately, the level of drug addiction in the socialist countries is still far below that which has afflicted the West. But each country is following a generally typical path. Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria are mainly recording instances of toxic substance abuse—the initial form of drug addiction. In the Soviet Union the use of plant-based drugs is most widespread. That is the second stage. But because of natural conditions that stage has been bypassed in Hungary and Poland and the struggle there is being waged against "hard" [tyazhelyy] chemical-based drugs.

It seemed for a long time as though drug addiction did not exist in our country. But when society finally realized the social consequences of the spread of this disease, the militia, our first "means of treatment" of all social ailments, was brought into action.

Participants in the conference were given a detailed report on the present situation in the campaign against drug addiction in the USSR by Lieutenant General of Militia V. Pankin, leader of the Soviet delegation and chief of the USSR MVD Main Criminal Investigation Administration:

Soviet laws envisage criminal liability for the manufacture and sale of narcotics.

Plant-based drugs predominate in our country at present. Users of hashish, opium, and poppy straw [soloma maka] make up more than 80 percent of those registered. That is no coincidence Last year the extent of the wild hemp fields was calculated. There proved to be more than 1,800,000 hectares.

The main regions of proliferation of hemp are Kazakhstan and Kirghizia (the famous Chui valley has 1.5 million hectares), the Far East, and the North Caucasus.... In a number of places special teams are being created to find and remove wild hemp. But effective means of destruction have still not been developed. Furthermore, no one knows what effect the destruction of such vast areas of this plant will have on the general state of environmental equilibrium.

In 1987 around 4,000 hectares of illicit poppy fields were discovered. This means that drugs worth approximately R150 million at black market prices did not go into circulation. In all the militia organs confiscate around 30-40 tonnes of narcotics and raw materials a year (worth about R250 million). And that is despite the fact that in the militia organs there are just 900 specialists engaged in the war against drugs. In the Chui valley there are just two staff workers in the department combatting drugs. The rest are assistants from other services.

There has been an increase in medicinal drug addiction in recent years. Narcotics can be manufactured quite easily from various chemical reagents. The main sources of obtaining them are pharmacies, medical institutions, and enterprises where medicines are made.

The number of people registered as having tried drugs at least once is now over 130,000. Some 51,000 of them are now suffering from drug addiction. It is especially alarming that two-thirds of users are young people.

Toxic substance abuse has developed into a serious problem. There are 22,000 people who use toxic substances. Of those 13,000 are minors. This is because toxic preparations are much more available than alcohol. This problem cannot be resolved by militia methods alone.

Despite the fact that drug addiction in our country has a localized character, V. Pankin stressed, the Soviet Union has demonstrated its readiness not to remain aloof from the international community in the solution of this problem. In 1987 we joined the UN fund for combatting

drug abuse and for the first time in many years the General Assembly voted for an increase in financial appropriations for the activity of the UN drug control organs.

The USSR supports the "method of keeping supplies under surveillance," as it is known. That work is already yielding practical results now. Last year saw the confiscation of around 10,000 tonnes of hashish which had been in transit through our country. In fall 1987 Soviet law enforcement organs cooperated with their Canadian colleagues in conducting an operation which resulted in the confiscation of 1.5 tonnes of hashish. This helped to expose an international criminal gang of drug traffickers....

In recent years contacts among the socialist community countries have been acquiring new content and have been expanding intensively. Primarily in the socioeconomic and cultural spheres. But with such processes there is also the danger of the spread of negative social phenomena into neighboring countries and of the intermingling of criminal elements. Thus the process of the overall rapprochement among the social countries requires a pooling of efforts by their law enforcement organs. The very fact that a conference like the one in Tashkent is being held meets objective requirements.

It is no coincidence that the struggle against drug addiction was chosen as the first targeted program for cooperation. By its very nature this type of criminal activity is international and cannot be eradicated within the boundaries of a single country. Joint efforts are needed here more than anywhere.

One of the most valuable results of the Tashkent conference is the elaboration by all the participants of an integrated approach to the evaluation of drug addiction as a social phenomenon.

The use of narcotics, Colonel Khristo Boyanov Velichkov, leader of the Bulgarian delegation and chief of the Criminal Investigations Administration of the People's Militia Directorate, said in his speech, is due largely to a breakdown in the individual's relationship with the social environment. Drug addiction is a specific phenomenon which has arisen in certain social conditions.

This viewpoint was supported by V. Gordiyenko, chief of the criminal investigations administration of the Uzbek SSR MVD.

Social processes and conflicts are the preconditions for an increase in the number of drug addicts, he said. They have not been studied scientifically. Unless we know the causes of the phenomenon we cannot combat it effectively.

Previously the struggle was waged not against the problem itself but only against its outward manifestations. Thus the official line of the campaign against drug addiction purely by punitive measures had the opposite effect—the rapid spread of drug addiction among young people and the establishment of criminal gangs and steady drug supply routes....

Another practical result of the Tashkent conference was the comparison of statistics produced in various countries about the composition of "high risk groups."

According to Bulgarian researchers' figures, the use of narcotics to alleviate social and psychological stress is typical primarily of people with a low level of general culture. They repudiated the myth that a high living standard and surfeit create a craving for drugs.

In the USSR 1 drug addict in 2 is a worker or employee and 1 in 10 is a student. In the overwhelming majority of cases—75.3 percent—the drug-taking habit began out of curiosity or to imitate others.

A comparison of analytical information makes it possible to establish a "point of intersection" and to determine with greater accuracy the risk groups in greatest danger. This in turn enables the law enforcement organs to target their preventive work more accurately and thus be more effective.

The point of the Tashkent conference was not to report to one another on great successes achieved or individual shortcomings which by some miracle have survived intact. No, that recently very widespread type of international exchange of opinions is gradually becoming a thing of the past. The conference held a frank and objective discussion. "In the matter of combatting drug addiction," V. Pankin repeatedly stressed during the meeting, "the Soviet side does not intend to act as the teacher with the socialist countries as its pupils. The situation is such that we must all learn from each other."

The meeting resulted in the signing by all participants of a protocol on cooperation in the sphere of combatting drug addiction. It was agreed to exchange operational information on these questions and to share the results of scientific research and technical studies. It was decided to hold regular meetings of this kind.

Oganov Ponders Theses' Foreign Policy Statement

PM2606102988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 23 Jun 88 p 1

[Political observer Grigoriy Oganov article under the rubric "19th All-Union Conference: Between the Lines of the CPSU Central Committee Theses": "The Main Question. Reflecting on a Contradictory, Interlinked, and Largely Integral World"—boldface passages as published]

[Text] **"On the basis of the first 3 years of restructuring, the main question which concerns our people and all the peoples most of all—has it been possible to diminish the threat of war?—can undoubtedly be answered in the affirmative. The direct threat of a war involving the major powers has diminished. The international position of the Soviet Union has notably improved, and not through building up strength but by increasing trust in our country."**

From the CPSU Central Committee Theses.

Point 10 of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference raises the main question of our time—the question of war and peace—with unusual poignancy, clarity, profoundly substantiated arguments, and—and this is quite important—with confidence.

In my view, the poignancy of this question stems from the bold and frank realization, the only one that befits Communists, that there are substantial inconsistencies between, on the one hand, the interpretation of the processes of world development and of our foreign policy's practical implementation and, on the other hand, the real state of affairs and the opportunities available to mankind in the last 25 years of the 20th century.

Great courage and a genuine sense of international responsibility are needed in order to admit: Foreign policy was allowed to lag behind the fundamental changes which occurred in the world, while the new, not very [illegible]ar, but promising prospects for easing international tension and increasing mutual understanding between the millions of people inhabiting our world were not fully implemented.

Facts are facts: We seemed to accept the "rules of the game" elaborated a long time ago by the most bellicose and militarist circles of imperialism. Let us not analyze now with hindsight how we were catapulted into an atmosphere of confrontation, how we got involved in the arms race, and whether we were forced into it or whether we were perfectly capable of rejecting these "rules" and attempting to switch the points along the track of a train whose every car represents a people, a nation, or a country, and turn it along the tracks of "danger-free ride."

Ultimately, this is not a matter of guessing what would have happened if only.... Nor are we going to explain to what extent our positions in the world were in line with the lofty ideas of the Marxist-Leninist approach toward global problems which have acquired paramount importance, or with a realistic awareness of the nature of socialism, including ideas like international duty, which we consider natural.

Something else is important: Since April 1985, the party has been engaged in the difficult and painstaking job of "taking stock" of problems in world politics, of examining all aspects of international relations in today's world and of all lines within the spectrum of the Soviet foreign policy course. It is important to emphasize that this course was invariably based on **Lenin's concepts of peaceful coexistence** between two opposed socioeconomic systems and on the laws governing changes in a complex and contradictory world permeated with trends opposing each other.

As a result of this work, of the profound scientific analysis of contemporary realities, there emerged the dialectics of the present stage of world development as a struggle of opposites in conditions of a growing tendency toward interdependence of states comprising a largely integral world. Further quest led to the promotion of the idea of creating an all-embracing system of international security at the 27th CPSU Congress.

Putting this radical idea forward, we scrupulously adhered to proclaimed principles in our foreign policy international actions, in all acts and deeds in the world arena. The entire style of our foreign policy activity underwent radical change.

We began not only to pontificate using the method of diplomatic notes and menacing, even though fair, TASS statements, but also to listen to our interlocutors and opponents. We added to the idea of "communication" the fairly important idea of "feedback," and the range of Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerns started including more and more talks whose purpose was not only to state positions but also to gradually bring them closer together, to reach mutually acceptable compromises. Dialogue gradually became a rule of our international relations, and this made Soviet diplomacy's activity far more productive.

A special role in the swiftly emerging changes was played by the concept of **new thinking** brought in line with the realities of the nuclear age and the global threats hanging over mankind.

First, it presupposed renunciation of the views of international security as a product of military might, of the quantity and quality of mass destruction weapons piled up in the nuclear, chemical, and all sorts of other arsenals of the powers. After all, the concept of attaining military-strategic parity with the hypothetical opponent,

which seemed to us until quite recently to offer a reliable guarantee against all unpleasant turns of events, in actual fact guaranteed just one thing: the likelihood of apocalyptic mutual destruction.

Second, it introduces in foreign policy thinking the mighty authority of modern science, which has reached the unambiguous conclusion that a nuclear war must not be fought and that victory in a nuclear war is impossible. We all know, for example, the mighty effect on the minds and moods of people in all continents produced by the hypothesis of an inevitable "nuclear winter" estimated by U.S. and Soviet scientists. Generally speaking, the new thinking is strictly scientific thinking, rejecting historically obsolete stereotypes and delusions.

Third, it creates real and profoundly substantiated prerequisites for the promotion of a series of major ideas advancing the cause of peace and security, including radical ideas like the program for eliminating all accumulated stockpiles of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and beginning the 3d millennium in the conditions of a nuclear-free world.

Anyone who has carefully and thoughtfully read the text of the CPSU Central Committee Theses, and Point 10 of the Theses in particular, could not have failed to notice that in essence, and in contrast with the other points, Point 10 immediately and directly concerns our Western partners and rivals, and that the imperatives and proposals contained therein are addressed to Western politicians and to Soviet people alike.

In fact, this is **a call to interpret** the situation prevailing in the world, a call to advance along the path of civilized international relations. The CPSU documents identify the main landmarks along this path and offer a basic description of the ways and conditions for their attainment.

It must also be borne in mind that the new thinking is not a one-way street, that it presupposes a sincere response, an open declaration of readiness to follow the path of decisive and favorable change of relations in the West-East, USSR-United States, NATO-Warsaw Pact, and CEMA-EEC system. Major positive changes have been recently achieved in the atmosphere of these mutual relations, making it possible to hope for their further positive development.

Even so, we are far from a sense of euphoria, from "radiant" expectations of an overnight leap from highly sinister confrontation to "peace on earth and prosperity among men."

I say this because I recall a letter from one of our readers, reproaching me for my supposedly unfriendly and even disrespectful attitude toward President Reagan who came to Moscow with a smile on his lips and spoke quite a few very pleasant words. The cause of the letter writer's irritation was the fact that I had mentioned the U.S. President's relatively recent statement about the "evil empire" and the order to "bomb Moscow" in 5 minutes. I had remarked that time changes even ideologically "sound," although not very moral, views....

Let me repeat, we are far from feeling euphoric. "We are not disregarding the militarist danger inherent in the nature of imperialism.... The influence of the realities of the modern world and the possible modifications of a number of objective factors that have given rise to war make it possible to think that the safeguarding of states' security will increasingly move out of the sphere of the correlation of military potentials into the sphere of politics, the primacy of law, and common human morality in the fulfillment of international commitments." This is a quotation from the 10th Thesis.

Much is being said nowadays about measures of trust. There is no doubt that trust is a necessary element of successful progress toward a nuclear-free world. But do you recall Reagan's favorite proverb: "Trust, but verify?" As far as I am concerned, I prefer to judge the intentions of powers not by diplomats' speeches at banquets but by the figures in the latest military budget....

NATO Decision on Force for Norway Deplored

LD2506133688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 25 Jun 88

["Saturday Panorama" with commentator Aleksandr Korshunov]

[Text] NATO has officially reported a new type of multinational military fighting force intended for actions on the bloc's northern flank in Norway is to be set up.

As has been announced in Brussels, the Atlanticists' headquarters, this fighting force will be formed on the basis of U.S., Canadian, and West German units. They are to replace the Canadian brigade which will be withdrawn from Norway.

Now, after this report, observers are occupied maybe by one delicate question: What is the attitude of the Norwegians themselves to this? The point is that the NATO decision opens the way to Norwegian territory for the West German troops that were there most recently before 1945.

By the way, to judge from the statement of Norwegian Prime Minister Brundtland, a candidate for the Noble Peace Prize, the matter is clear. REUTER cites her statement, I quote: This decision will increase our defense capabilities in important areas. And she added: The decision is evidence of the allies' increasing preoccupation with Norway's defense.

But, unfortunately, there is no answer to the question as to why this preoccupation is nevertheless increasing. Indeed, is it not the notorious threat from the East that is meant here?

It remains only to deplore that such a decision is being made in response to numerous proposals by our country to reduce the level of military confrontation in northern Europe, including also the seas washing it.

Demichev Speaks at Nuclear-Free Zones Meeting
PM2306133188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA and TASS own correspondents dispatch: "In Support of Nuclear-Free Zones"]

[Text] Berlin, 20 Jun—The international meeting for nuclear-free zones has begun its work in the GDR capital's Palace of the Republic. It is being held on the initiative of the German socialist state. More than 1,000 people from 113 countries and all continents are taking part in it. They include more than 80 official representatives of states, including vice presidents, heads of government, and foreign ministers, delegations from parliaments, social democratic, socialist, communist, and worker parties, and also national democratic, liberal, and other bourgeois parties. Representatives have been sent by 52 international organizations.

The Soviet delegation is led by P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The meeting was opened by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council.

The representative composition of the meeting's participants, he said, illustrates that the desire for the creation of a secure and nuclear-free world and for a stable peace encompasses all continents.

The recent Moscow summit between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan achieved positive results regarding further advancing the disarmament process and taking further steps forward on the path of improving the international situation. I think that this will impart growing confidence to all who are convinced that there is a chance of preventing mankind from perishing in the inferno of a nuclear holocaust.

The exchange of ratification instruments between the leaders of the USSR and the United States, the speaker continued, marked the entry into force of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. On behalf of the GDR, which made great efforts to ensure the appearance of this treaty, I would like to express in this connection my feelings of joy and profound satisfaction.

A terrible potential of weapons of mass destruction has been accumulated in the center of Europe, Erich Honecker pointed out. Europe has become a nuclear powder keg in the world. That is why there is an urgent need to rid it of nuclear weapons.

Experience accumulated since the late seventies shows that siting nuclear weapons in central Europe has not helped strengthen security. The fundamental security interests of all Europeans have placed the matter of ridding central Europe of nuclear weapons on the agenda. A nuclear-free corridor would help to markedly lower the level of military confrontation on our continent, deepen the process of confidence-building, and broaden possibilities of further disarmament. It goes without saying that a nuclear-free zone will at any rate require a constructive contribution from the appropriate nuclear powers. We were greatly encouraged in our efforts by M.S. Gorbachev's official statement of 10 April 1987 on the USSR's readiness to withdraw its nuclear weapons from the planned corridor and also to respect and guarantee its nuclear-free status.

The GDR would welcome the creation of mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of crises and the prevention of military incidents in central Europe, E. Honecker said, in order to create in central Europe more favorable conditions for such steps and still further stabilize the situation along the dividing line between the military-political alliances. For instance, the establishment of a "hot line" between Prague, Berlin, and Bonn and the creation, if you like, of a permanent confidence-building center equipped with the appropriate technology could be such a mechanism.

P.N. Demichev, the Soviet delegation head, sincerely thanked Erich Honecker and the friends from the GDR on behalf of the Soviet leadership for the initiative of holding an international meeting for nuclear-free zones. He read out the greetings message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the meeting's participants, which was greeted warmly by the gathering.

The meeting in Berlin, P.N. Demichev said, is taking place at a time when the entire vast mass of realities of the nuclear age which evoke universal concern has still not been pushed aside, but when the era of nuclear disarmament has begun. By this I mean the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow and the entry into force of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

In Moscow a rapprochement was recorded in positions on a number of aspects of the problem of reducing strategic offensive arms while observing the ABM Treaty, of limiting and cutting nuclear tests, and of banning chemical weapons.

The meeting in Moscow is also a step forward along the path of imparting to Soviet-U.S. relations a new quality that would help transform the two great powers from poles of confrontation into partners in the quest for a solution to seemingly fatal conflicts of contemporary history. Indisputably, it expanded the possibilities for the formation of a favorable political climate in the world arena.

Throughout the world, hopes are growing about the possibility of removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe looming over mankind. The realities of the nuclear age and the objective need for qualitatively new approaches to the solution of fundamental problems of ensuring security have substantially shaken the stereotypes of the old political thinking.

The task is to do everything to render all these processes irreversible. The position-of-strength policy must be renounced in order to achieve this. Everyone must acknowledge the social, political, and cultural diversity of the modern world. Everyone must acknowledge each people's right to freely choose their own social system.

Mankind still has a long way to go toward a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. The creation of nuclear-free zones is a real manifestation of good will, reason, the new approach to the resolution of the most complex international problems, and renunciation of the policy of strength.

The peoples of the world consider M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986, in which he put forward a program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, to be a genuine manifestation of the new political thinking and the new morality. We are delighted to note today that this program, the Soviet Union's idea of creating an all-embracing system of international security, and other major initiatives which we and the allied socialist countries have prepared and submitted, are beginning to be practically implemented step by step.

The thrust of the course of building a nuclear-free world has met with support from the United Nations, especially the "Group of 77," the Nonaligned Movement, and influential public organizations and movements. The entire world is gradually increasingly coming to realize that nuclear war is senseless and irrational and that it can have no victors or vanquished, since it would mean the end of human civilization. One must also realize that war using conventional arms can today have a similar effect to a nuclear war both in view of the increase in conventional arms' destructive potential and also in view of the ever-increasing numbers of nuclear power stations in various regions.

The struggle for all-embracing international security and a nuclear-free world and the creation of nuclear-free zones are seen in the minds of the world public as interconnected and interdependent processes. Quite naturally, the real successes on the path of nuclear disarmament are stepping up the movement for nuclear-free zones. This is also illustrated by our highly representative meeting. Parliaments are increasingly becoming involved in this process. Here the meeting of CSCE states' parliamentarians held in Sofia on 31 May-2 June this year should be mentioned.

Important steps have already been taken to prevent the appearance of nuclear weapons in various spheres. The 1967 treaty bans the emplacement of nuclear weapons in space, on the moon, and on other celestial bodies, and the 1971 treaty bans their emplacement on the seabed and ocean floor. The 1959 Antarctic Treaty turned an entire major geographical region into an effectively demilitarized zone. In 1967, the Tlatelolco treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America was concluded, and in 1985, the South Pacific forum approved the Raratonga Treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the region. Various population centers, cities, and regions are increasingly proclaiming themselves nuclear-weapon-free zones. The pledge by a number of states not to produce, acquire, or permit the siting of nuclear weapons on their territory cannot fail to arouse respect among the world public.

The Soviet Union sincerely supports the desire of states and peoples to secure themselves against the threat of being drawn into a nuclear conflagration by creating nuclear-free zones. This question is of fundamental importance for us. A clause on this subject was incorporated in the party program adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress.

Our country initiated and was a signatory to the first three aforementioned treaties and guaranteed the nuclear-free status of the two latter treaties. We insistently call upon states who have still not signed these important international agreements to accede to them.

Some people in the world doubt the effectiveness of nuclear-free zones.

As for the Soviet Union, it holds an active constructive position on this question. The USSR has solemnly stated that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons and will never under any circumstances use them against non-nuclear states that do not permit nuclear weapons to be sited on their territory. Our pledges regarding nuclear-free zones are formulated in a similar manner.

Practical steps to create nuclear-free zones largely depend on the attitude of the members of the military alliances whose armed forces are equipped with nuclear systems. The Warsaw Pact states again advocated "promoting the creation of nuclear-free zones on the initiative of states from the respective regions" in a memorandum presented to the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament.

We drew attention to the fact that NATO countries stated for their part in April 1986 at the disarmament conference that "encouragement must be given to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones which will strengthen universal security and stability while pursuing the ultimate aim: creation of a world completely free from nuclear weapons." The consistent practical implementation of this position, above all, by the NATO nuclear powers, could help strengthen peace and security.

The nonaligned countries' Harare Declaration of 1986 confirmed that the creation of nuclear-free zones would be an important step on the path of disarmament.

Lastly, the opinion of the entire world community is expressed in the unanimously approved final document of the first UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, which is now called a Charter for Disarmament.

At the same time, the question quite legitimately arises: Why have most of the initiatives aimed at the creation of such zones hitherto remained at the stage of drafts and wishes?

The viewpoint that the creation of nuclear-free zones may lead to a weakening in the forces of nuclear deterrence and consequently, it is alleged, to an increase rather than a decrease in the threat of war is one of the main obstacles. Adherence to the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" impedes the creation of nuclear-free zones. That is why the view of nuclear-free zones solely as a kind of "addendum" to the Nonproliferation Treaty which must not affect deterrence is still current.

Of course, nuclear-free zones play and will play an important and ever-increasing role as one of the means of strengthening the nuclear weapons nonproliferation system. But their significance is not merely confined to this.

The creation of nuclear-free zones, in our opinion, has a positive effect on various aspects of world development. It strengthens regional and international trust and has a fruitful effect on the resolution of a whole series of global problems. The Delhi Declaration on the principles of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi 27 November 1986, stressed that "only disarmament can release the vast additional resources necessary to combat economic backwardness and poverty."

By proclaiming their countries and regions nuclear-free zones, states are taking an important step to strengthen their national sovereignty and independence. This action proclaims their love of peace.

It is sometimes said that since nuclear weapons can be delivered to any point on the globe, nuclear-free zones are unrealistic and cannot guarantee security. This opinion seems correct, but only inasmuch as not all nuclear powers are yet ready to assume the relevant guarantees and inasmuch as the creation of nuclear-free zones is taken out of the context of the peoples' common struggle for peace and disarmament. The creation of nuclear-free zones must be viewed as one of the avenues in the process of eliminating nuclear weapons.

One cannot fail to see that the creation of nuclear-free zones assumes particular significance for regions which are saturated with nuclear arms. Then the creation of nuclear-free zones is a form of vigorous offensive against the nuclear danger.

A nuclear-free zone or corridor is an extremely essential measure in order to reduce the danger latent in the confrontation of armed forces in regions where the military blocs' armies are in direct contact.

Under current conditions, a nuclear-free zone is also a real step toward the implementation of the idea of a nonoffensive military doctrine. Nuclear weapons are not a piece of property which can be held "just in case." They are in a state of constant readiness and can be used at a moment's notice.

Europe is a region where the danger of an excessive concentration of weapons is self-evident. Let me recall that the idea of creating nuclear-free zones in Europe goes back a long way. In 1956, the USSR proposed banning the siting in central Europe of "nuclear formations and any kind of nuclear or hydrogen weapons." In 1963, Finnish President U. Kekkonen put forward the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe.

The Soviet Union put forward a proposal on the creation of nuclear-free zones on the continent at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

The USSR totally supports the proposal from the GDR and the CSSR on the creation of a nuclear-free corridor and a chemical weapons-free zone in central Europe. We have stated our readiness to withdraw from such a corridor all Soviet nuclear systems and to guarantee and respect the zone's nuclear-free status.

Today proposals on the creation of nuclear-free zones are assuming particular topicality as another important avenue to rid Europe—where the process of eliminating nuclear weapons has already begun—of nuclear weapons.

In the opinion of the USSR, there is every reason to move on to the practical implementation of the proposals on a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe by giving the Baltic nuclear-free status and implementing appropriate measures in the territories bordering the future nuclear-free zone, including our territory.

We think that Balkan countries would feel more confident and calm if the Bulgarian and Romanian proposals regarding the transformation of this region into a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons were implemented.

The formula "Europe is our common home" put forward by Comrade Gorbachev is increasingly meeting with general recognition among Europeans.

Of course, our plans are not only confined to Europe. The Soviet Union, as you know, is persistently striving to create reliable security in the Asia-Pacific region and the Indian Ocean zone and is advancing appropriate constructive proposals to put an end to military activity in the Near and Middle East, in the Persian Gulf region, in the south of Africa, and in Central America. The agreements that have been secured on Afghanistan are a good example for the removal of other seats of tension. The USSR supports all positive initiatives leading to the strengthening of peace in any region. We fully understand the ever-increasing demands from the public and states to proclaim Africa, Southeast Asia, the Korean peninsula, and the Near East nuclear-free zones.

It is the task of the current third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, at which the Soviet Union has put forward a new program for joint actions containing a number of concrete proposals, to give a powerful boost to the strengthening of universal security.

We believe that the time has come to assert nonmilitary guarantees of universal security and for states to adopt a defensive strategy and the principle of sufficiency for defense. We propose to begin the reduction of conventional arms by removing existing imbalances and asymmetries on the basis of exchanging and verifying data and to set the task of eliminating foreign military presence and military bases on other countries' territories by the year 2000. We are prepared to participate in the creation of an international agency under UN auspices to observe and verify disarmament. Naturally, one of the most important tasks is to prevent the appearance of nuclear weapons in space and the pollution of space. We favor making real progress regarding the banning of nuclear tests.

The 19th all-union party conference will soon take place in our country, at which key questions of the modern phase of restructuring in our country will be discussed.

There is an organic, direct link between the restructuring being implemented in our country and the foreign policy course aimed at democratizing international ties and profoundly humanizing them. By critically reevaluating postwar processes and analyzing the opportunities that have been missed for stabilizing the international situation and preventing the arms race, we want to correctly assess the various means for strengthening peoples' peace and security and pooling everyone's efforts to find ways out of the dangerous deadlocks in international relations.

We believe in human reason. A peaceful future for the planet can only be ensured by common efforts from all states and peoples and various public forces.

Allow me to express the conviction that we will avert the threat of nuclear apocalypse by joint efforts, P.N. Demichev said in conclusion.

The meeting continues.

Babenko Views Conference

LD2406043688 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 Jun (TASS)—TASS political observer Yevgeniy Babenko writes:

Efforts to create a safe planet free of nuclear nuclear weapons and for a lasting peace embraces all continents. This thought strikes you when you see for yourself the reports from the GDR capital, where an international meeting in support of nuclear-free zones has just ended. The meeting brought together more than a thousand eminent statesmen and public figures, representatives of political parties and international organisations, scientists and cultural figures, and priests from more than 110 countries.

Those who attended the meeting became convinced that the creation of nuclear-free zones on various continents would be regarded as a real sign of goodwill and reason, of a new approach to solving extremely complicated international problems, as a renunciation of the policy of dealing from a position of force.

The formation of such zones is not an absolute panacea to combat a world nuclear conflagration. At the same time, their value, as indicated in the greeting message from M.S. Gorbachev to the participants in this international forum, lies in the fact that nuclear-free zones can help reduce nuclear preparations, separate the nuclear forces of the confronting unions, and thereby reduce the risk of a nuclear conflict.

It would appear that the creation of nuclear-free zones benefits everyone. In the West, however, reservations are expressed that the appearance of such zones may lead to a weakening of the existing nuclear weapons through which the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" is sustained. It is also asserted that the "locating on different sides" [as received] of nuclear arsenals only creates an illusion of security. Creating a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe—it is alleged—would give a one-sided advantage to the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Such interpretations were debunked by many speakers, including Egon Bahr, leader of the West German Social Democrats delegation. The delegates' attention was drawn by the Soviet proposal to begin reducing conventional weapons by eliminating existing imbalances and asymetries based on a reciprocal exchange of data and

verification of that data, and eliminating foreign military presence and military bases on other countries' territories by the year 2000. According to H. Mies, chairman of the German Communist Party, this initiative will give a powerful new spur to the fight for nuclear disarmament. Naturally, one of the most important tasks is to avert the eventuality of weapons in space—the pollution of space.

During the fruitful discussions in Berlin, general conclusions were drawn on various proposals aimed at drawing up further steps toward a nuclear-free world, at confidence-building and strengthening cooperation, at settling regional conflicts and providing guarantees for and ensuring monitoring and verification of nuclear-free zones. The international meeting, convened at the GDR's initiative, demonstrated that the creation of nuclear-free zones fosters international trust, promotes stability in relations between the nuclear powers, and strengthens the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

CEMA Secretary Sychev Interviewed on EEC Ties

PM2806094588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Jun 88 Second Edition p 7

[Interview with CEMA Secretary V.V. Sychev by own correspondents V. Drobkov and V. Sharov: "CEMA-EEC: Mutual Interest"—date, place not given, first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The signing of the Joint Declaration on the Establishment of Official Relations between CEMA and the EEC in Luxembourg on 25 June will be added to the recent events produced by new realistic approaches in international politics and improving the situation. CEMA and the EEC are major interstate economic organizations. The normalization of relations between them holds out the prospect of many advantages for both sides. Today CEMA Secretary V.V. Sychev answers PRAVDA correspondents' questions.

[Question] Vyacheslav Vladimirovich, how do you assess the establishment of official relations between CEMA and the EEC?

[Sychev] First and foremost, it should be noted that the signing of the declaration puts an end to the abnormal and anachronistic situation whereby CEMA, which is preparing to celebrate its 40th anniversary, and the EEC, which is entering its 4th decade of existence, had no official relations. First, the rectification of this "anomaly" creates more favorable conditions for developing trade and economic exchanges between the countries making up the two organizations. Second—and I would particularly like to underline this—new prospects open up for extensive CEMA-EEC cooperation in the most varied areas and in the implementation of major joint projects. Finally, the establishment of CEMA-EEC relations will have the most positive impact on the political climate in Europe and worldwide.

[Question] We would like a few more details about the prospects for CEMA-EEC cooperation. Which avenues of it do you consider to be of the highest priority and the most promising?

[Sychev] I would point out, for instance, environmental protection. Nowadays, it is often impossible to resolve ecological problems if one restricts oneself to the framework of a single country. Even the efforts of several states may be insufficient. These problems are often continent-wide or global. Exchanges of the experience already existing in this sphere and the development of joint programs would be of immense importance.

Or take the questions of developing and improving the transportation network in Europe. I have taken part in international seminars and symposiums held in recent years in the FRG, Italy, and Belgium. These discussed, in particular, the prospects for cooperation between CEMA and EEC countries in the transportation sphere.

Let us turn to power generation. For instance, why should we not give joint thought to collaboration between major power grids in Europe? It is well known that the larger a grid, the more reliable and stable it is. Why not pool our efforts in this area?

Both sides are greatly interested in questions of scientific and technical cooperation. As is well known, CEMA has been working for 2 and ½ years on the implementation of a comprehensive program for the scientific and technical progress of its members through the year 2000. Slightly before we started, West Europe adopted the similar "Eureka" program. The priority avenues of both programs are relatively close. Of course, both sides would gain from organizing cooperation on specific problems.

Resolution of the questions of standardization and unification of output are of immense importance for trade exchanges and economic development. Here, too, our interests most often coincide.

I would like to note that the signing of the declaration is an important step, but just the first. It should be followed—and this must not be postponed—by concrete actions, and detailed talks should be started, we think, on possible areas of practical cooperation between CEMA and the EEC. Here in CEMA, we are preparing our "portfolio" of proposals, so to speak.

[Question] As is well known, the establishment of relations between the two organizations does not rule out the development of ties between individual CEMA countries and the EEC. From time to time, claims appear in the Western press that CEMA is virtually striving to "split" the West. What do you say on that score?

[Sychev] There has always been and will continue to be speculation about who wants to "split" whom. This speculation does not deserve any attention. But essentially, I can say the following.

Our common position in CEMA is that the establishment of CEMA-EEC relations not only does not hamper but, on the contrary, will promote the development of ties between individual CEMA members with the EEC. The correctness of this thesis is confirmed if only by the fact that specific steps have already been taken in this direction. The Soviet Union, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria have expressed willingness to establish official relations with the EEC. Following this, it is to be assumed that the question of the elaboration and conclusion of trade agreements will arise.

[Question] But surely CEMA and EEC countries have been trading before?

[Sychev] Yes. And the volume of this trade has been quite considerable. Moreover, many European CEMA countries have so-called sector agreements with the EEC—on trade in certain kinds of goods. In a number of cases, the economic ties between certain CEMA countries and EEC states are developing on the basis of intergovernmental agreements. I recall the agreements between the USSR and certain EEC countries on deliveries of natural gas and the construction of large chemical, metallurgical, and light industrial enterprises. More and more joint ventures have been set up recently.

At the same time, we cannot fail to note that certain forces in the West are continually attempting to impede these processes and to complicate the socialist community countries' participation in international business cooperation. They create obstacles to obtaining credit and strictly control the sale of a number of goods to us. That is why trade volume is very unstable and subject to considerable fluctuations. At the same time, trade turnover is also affected by notable price fluctuations, mainly for goods in the fuel and raw materials group.

The CEMA countries' trade turnover with the EEC members in 1987 was around R40 billion, which is somewhat higher than the 1986 level, but lower than the level reached in 1983-1985.

More than 60 percent of CEMA countries' exports to EEC states are made up of fuel and raw materials, including raw materials for the production of foodstuffs. Machines and equipment only account for around 7 percent. CEMA country imports present a quite different picture: Machine-building items make up more than 35 percent. Naturally, this situation cannot suit us. The CEMA intends to strive to rectify it.

We think that the signing of the declaration will mark the start of new initiatives and promote development of more balanced economic ties between CEMA and EEC countries. In our opinion, there is considerable unutilized potential in this sphere. This includes changes in the structure of reciprocal goods deliveries and the eradication of all kinds of restrictions. Life demands a more extensive implementation of new forms of economic cooperation: creation of joint enterprises and joint-stock companies, development of direct ties, and so forth.

[Question] After the first reports about the conclusion of CEMA-EEC talks, PRAVDA readers have been asking whether the road to the signing of the declaration was too long. What can you say to that?

[Sychev] We can talk about two stages in these talks. The first contacts between CEMA and the EEC took place back in 1973, but then the sides' approaches were too different. The talks had no concrete results. In April 1985, CEMA put forward an initiative to restart consultations on the establishment of CEMA-EEC relations. It is 3 years since then. That is a great deal and not a great deal. In this period, there has been a whole series of official and unofficial meetings between experts and representatives of CEMA Secretariat and the EEC Commission. We have faced difficult questions. It was necessary to bring the sides' positions much closer together without foregoing fundamental interests.

I would recall the following point: In 1986 and 1987, delegations from different factions from the European Parliament visited us. They included Conservatives, Social Democrats, and Communists. The activeness of the European Parliament representatives who advocated the normalization of EEC-CEMA relations played its part. I must say that economic interest in conjunction with the political will shown by both sides finally bore fruit.

If we draw up the chronology of the declaration's development—exchanges of letters, messages, and expert consultations—we can see that both sides often had to wait 2 or 3 months for replies. And that is understandable. There are 12 countries in the EEC and 10 in CEMA. The latest document, new proposal, or draft compromise had to be agreed with each of them and unanimity reached. This was at times difficult, although sometimes we got the impression that everything could have been done more quickly.

[Question] We know that there was quite a long discussion on the West Berlin question. On what terms was a compromise reached?

[Sychev] This was a really complex issue. The discussion centered on the so-called "territorial proviso." The point being that all documents that have ever been signed on behalf of the EEC invariably include the formula that the document in question applies to those territories covered by the Treaty of Rome on the creation of the EEC. In particular, this formula covered West Berlin. During the talks we proceeded on the basis of two obvious circumstances. Nobody doubts the reality of the existing economic ties between West Berlin and the FRG and the other EEC countries—that is one thing. But, on the other hand, there is no question—nor can there be any—of the

political, much less military, integration of West Berlin and the FRG. This is clearly recorded in the four-party agreement of 3 September 1971.

Ultimately, we found a formula which suited both sides. The "territorial proviso" was made part of the text of the declaration. At the same time, CEMA representatives on behalf of nine CEMA members will make the following statement when signing the document: Nothing in the joint declaration affects or can affect the four-party agreement of 3 September 1971. And EEC representatives will confirm receipt of this statement.

[Question] So will we get down to work after the declaration is signed?

[Sychev] Yes, and we are prepared to carry out the accords honestly and consistently. We expect the same from the EEC.

CEMA is now going through a particularly crucial period. The restructuring of the mechanism of cooperation and socialist economic integration is under way. The CEMA countries are fully resolved to raise restructuring, and, consequently, their own economies, to a qualitatively new level. We hope that the socialist community's role in world processes will grow. CEMA is becoming an even more powerful and dynamic force in the world economy and an even more attractive partner in economic cooperation. The normalization of relations with the EEC is further proof of that.

Grigoryev on Party Conference, 'Big Seven'
PM2706093188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[Yevgeniy Grigoryev "International Review": "The World This Week"]

[Excerpt] Fateful Factor [subhead]

On the eve of the 19th all-union party conference, it is clear how well founded is the statement in the CPSU Central Committee Theses that "restructuring in the USSR has become a factor of worldwide importance." Take Canadian Radio as an example. The day before yesterday, it stated: "Glasnost and restructuring are two political phenomena on which general attention is currently focused.... All eyes are turned in expectation to Moscow to see what direction the party conference recommendations will take."

Poland's TRYBUNA LUDU notes that the CPSU Central Committee Theses have created good opportunities for pondering Lenin's concept of democracy and enhancing the party's leading role. Our friends and like-minded people wish the conference success.

London's THE GUARDIAN deemed it necessary the other day to familiarize its readers with our party document, publishing it under the heading "The 10 Historic Theses of M.S. Gorbachev." The questions of the relationship between the domestic and foreign aspects of restructuring were discussed a conference of the political club of the Bavarian Evangelical Academy (FRG). Incidentally, this kind of forum has become virtually a daily occurrence in the most varied countries.

The truth about our country is becoming known to broad public circles. The "enemy image" is crumbling. As former U.S. Secretaries of State H. Kissinger and C. Vance admitted in their article in a June edition of NEWSWEEK, "in the eyes of many of our firmest friends, the Soviet threat to the free world has diminished."

That is a fact. But it is also a fact that it is deeply worrying for the West's propaganda services. They try to convince their own—and not only their own—audience that socialism is, so to speak, a "threat" for all time. In this connection, for instance, the Voice of America sometimes showers hypocritical compliments on glasnost and restructuring for the sake of pseudo-objectivity. At other times in commentaries "reflecting the U.S. Government's views," it puts forward (allegedly out of plain curiosity) the "small question" of whether the "ideological directives of the CPSU Program adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress" will be "rejected at the conference," no less. Otherwise, "as long as there are no fundamental changes in the USSR, the United States will have no option but to stand guard over Western security." This "ideology" is dangerous for the cause of peace.

It is good that nowadays by no means everyone in Washington tends to divorce themselves from reality. As National Security Adviser C. Powell has stated, even after implementation of the reforms, the USSR will still be led by the CPSU. Comprehension of realities also determines the fact that restructuring in the USSR is invariably among the most important topics of conversations and talks at literally all meetings of heads of government or leaders of political parties.

Grasping an Opportunity [subhead]

This was the case in Toronto, where the latest conference of the leaders of the capitalist world's "Big Seven"—the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Canada, and Japan—was held this week. Its political importance was largely determined by the fact that this was the first meeting of the Western "Areopagus" since the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow, the entry into force of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, and the beginning of the implementation of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan. The participants welcomed all these events. Their summation was that over the last year "there have been changes in relations between the Western countries and the Soviet Union in several important aspects."

The assessments of the present and the future voiced in Toronto were substantive. FRG Federal Chancellor H. Kohl expressed complete agreement with his partners that the current course in relations with the East should be continued, including a demonstration of openness for the development of relations with Moscow. British Prime Minister M. Thatcher spoke of a "time of unprecedented hope and opportunity in East-West relations."

Many other statements recently have been couched in optimistic terms. Presidential hopeful M. Dukakis said: "The world is changing, and the opportunities for achieving peace are truly beyond all imagining." It is worth noting that people in both East and West are arriving at close or identical political assessments of the state of and prospects for international development. RENMIN RIBAO published Deng Xiaoping's opinion the other day: "Today we are living in a comparatively good international situation, without a third world war."

Yes, it is indisputable that the direct threat of a war involving the major powers has diminished. The situation in the world has clearly become more stable and predictable. The prospects for curbing the arms race have become more tangible. Logically, we should grasp in every possible way this historic opportunity, continue without any interruption the process of working out important disarmament measures, and resolutely opt for new political thinking in everything. But in this area, unfortunately, by no means everything is straightforward [odnoznachno]—this is shown by the political declaration of the Toronto summit.

"We," it states, "reaffirmed our faith in construction and realistic dialogue and cooperation, including arms control, human rights, and regional questions as a way to achieve stability between East and West and to strengthen security at a lower level of arms." This is healthy and, on the whole, is a sensible political line. But further on "nuclear deterrence and the appropriate level of conventional arms" are proclaimed as "guarantees of peace." This is an old idea. Unlike previous summits, including last year's in Venice, it is being recommended not for all time but for the "foreseeable future"—even though this concept is very loose. A tribute to public sentiment? Maybe.

To all intents and purposes, Toronto proclaimed two essentially opposed courses. Incidentally, the "struggle of opposites" is not a new phenomenon and is quite typical of political conditions in the West. Militarist currents are sometimes strongly complicated and impeded by the reaching of accords in the interests of disarmament, settling of regional conflicts, and safeguarding of mankind's security.

The "philosophy of strength" and unilateral approaches to security problems are still quite deep-seated in the political consciousness of Western ruling circles. For instance, they stubbornly reduce the overall victory of the world community and the victory for reason and realism that was the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles exclusively to the impact of "Western firmness and unity"—and they did this in the Toronto statements, too. Hence the need to implement without fail their far-reaching military programs.

In Toronto, the Western route in the most important direction could be roughly described as follows: The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will be followed by an agreement on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons; later there will be something of a "hitch" in nuclear disarmament, and, incidentally, the focus is already switching to the question of conventional arms reduction. The emphasis is laid on the unilateral elimination of asymmetries and imbalances by the Warsaw Pact, even though, as is well known, these asymmetries and imbalances exist on the NATO side, too. It is understandable that there are substantial nuances in the stances of certain members of the Western alliance determined by the features of their position and objective security interests.

There will thus be an even bigger and more acute political and diplomatic struggle around the problems of disarmament and the ideas of a nonnuclear and nonviolent world. Public opinion can plan an important part in this struggle. One thing is indisputable: It is now no longer possible to block progress in the disarmament sphere. The effectiveness of this progress defines, as the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has shown, its own development logic: the strengthening of trust and new opportunities for shaping comprehensive international security.

Restructuring has the major inner strength of positively affecting the world. it has engendered new political thinking, galvanizing public and political thinking and actions in the interests of disarmament, security, and international cooperation. The international meeting for nuclear-free zones held in Berlin the other day was a reflection of these efforts. It had a wide impact. The signing in Luxembourg of a declaration establishing relations between the CEMA and the EEC was a major event in the building of a common European home. Things that were impossible for many, many years have been accomplished. And that, too, is a sign of the times. [passage omitted]

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'

LD2606182788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 26 Jun 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Gennadiy Vedenyapin, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; Boris Vasiliyevich Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, editorial board member of weekly ZA RUBEZHOM]

[Text] [Vedenyapin] Hello, comrades. Taking part in our meeting at the roundtable today are my colleague, the All-Union Radio foreign political commentator Boris

Vasiliyevich Andrianov, and Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, who is a member of the editorial board of the weekly ZA RUBEZHOM.

Among the events that have taken place on the international scene this week, one of the most prominent, perhaps, has been the international meeting in Berlin for nuclear-free zones. Proof of the undoubted importance of the problem that was discussed there is provided, in my view, by the very fact that there were more than a thousand emissaries from 113 countries taking part in the work of that forum—representing a very wide range of the political and social forces of our planet.

Those taking part in the meeting spent 3 days on a broad exchange of views on the main issue of our time: how to avert from mankind the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and how to ensure a peaceful future for all present inhabitants of the earth and for future generations. The single conclusion drawn was that, if there is to be ever less room on land and sea for nuclear weapons, there must be a joint effort by all governments and peoples. It was stressed at the same time that the planet needs oases of trust and stability, which can and must be provided by regional nuclear-free zones—those vital links in an integrated solution of the problems of international security.

[Andrianov] You know, what I noticed when the international meeting was being held in Berlin was the very high level of activity of the people who had gathered for the conference. In its nine commissions, speeches were made by more than 300 people: That's a very remarkable indication. True, those who took part in the discussion spoke at times from different standpoints. Yet one felt that they were united by a sincere desire to accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. It is surely not for nothing that, in discussing the vital problem of our time, the meeting's participants resolutely refuted the thesis put forward by certain political circles in the West that the process of setting up nuclear-free zones ought to be regarded as merely an insignificant makeweight supplementing the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. In resorting to such rhetoric, the opponents of the creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world and also a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe are not able, for all that, to reject out of hand, as the phrase goes, the positive significance of such step-by-step disarmament measures. And one must suppose that it is not by chance that a prominent representative of the German Social Democratic Party and member of the West German Bundestag, Egon Bahr, said in Berlin that in the present situation, especially since the concluding of the INF Treaty, a nuclear-free corridor in Europe would be the logical continuation of that document—a continuation reducing the danger from shorter-range missiles and other types of battlefield nuclear weapons.

[Volskiy] Now here I think our listeners may be wondering whether the world community is ready for the struggle to create such prohibited zones of peace free from nuclear armories. Well, I think the experience that has already been amassed in this field up until now enables one to answer in the affirmative. Here is a concrete example that such experience is plain to see: The Antarctic has virtually been turned into a demilitarized zone. The foundation of that was laid by the treaty of 1959. Then about 3 years ago, the member states of the South Pacific forum signed a treaty proclaiming the nuclear-free status of that vast region in the South Pacific. An active quest in the same direction is continuing in other regions of the world: in the Balkan Peninsula, in northern Europe, in the central part of our continent, and other places.

[Andrianov] I don't think I'll be wrong if I say that the entire work of the international meeting for nuclear-free zones which was held in Berlin was influenced by the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Of course, the world public considers that this first agreement on real disarmament in the nuclear age must be followed by a 50 percent reduction of strategic arsenals of weapons of mass destruction. And, by the way, many people must still have fresh in their memories the statement by U.S. President Reagan that a Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive arms could even be signed this year. But optimistic predictions of this kind are more and more being brought to naught by the skeptical statements that official representatives of Washington have recently been making.

[Volskiy] A typical example is an interview given to foreign journalists by the head of the U.s. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, Max Kampelman, which was broadcast by the Worldnet television network. In answer to questions from correspondents, Kampelman in effect confirmed that the United States is renouncing a number of previously agreed conditions for the signing of a treaty to reduce strategic offensive arms by 50 percent. Well, and how else can one assess, for example, the fact that Kampelman insisted on Washington's right to carry out whatever tests of ABM systems it chooses? He includes in such tests those that are quite definitely banned by the ABM Treaty. Who can believe that the leader of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks has forgotten that during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington, the sides undertook to observe that treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972?

[Vedenyapin] And, you know, the paradoxical thing is this: Max Kampelman assured the journalists that the United States has no intention of renouncing the ABM Treaty. Yet in the same breath, he began insisting on the Washington administration's right to interpret that document as it sees fit—depending on the progress of its projects for militarizing space. And what value can be attached to the other subterfuges—let us put it that way—that Kampelman demonstrated in his interview? He kept repeating, like an incantation, the statement that an agreement on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms is unlikely to be concluded this year, claiming that new obstacles have appeared in the way of achieving that aim, and that it's the Soviet Union that

has created them. He claims that therefore, the Soviet Union is to blame for the fact that it's no good even thinking in terms of signing the aforementioned document this year.

[Andrianov] Yes, that's precisely the impression Kampelman tried to create. From what he said, it emerges for example that the Soviet Union has—supposedly—changed its position as set forth at the Washington summit, and has now started insisting on solving the problem of sea-based cruise missiles as an absolute condition of concluding a treaty on strategic offensive arms. Well, what can one say to that? To use diplomatic language, Kampelman's assertion can certainly be called a staggering discovery, if one may put it that way. Such an ironic appraisal is more than legitimate, the point being that, from the very beginning of the talks on nuclear and space weapons, the Soviet Union has been posing the question on the need to solve the problem of sea-based cruise missiles—in other words, those installed on warships. It was none other than the U.S. side that tried to evade the solution. It was not until October of the year before last that the United States agreed at Reykjavik to get together in the search for a solution to that problem.

[Volskiy] I think it's relevant to recall here that in December of last year, at the summit meeting in Washington, the sides agreed—I quote—and pledged to establish limits on the number of such missiles and seek mutually acceptable and effective methods of verifying the implementation of such limitations. That, word for word, is what is stated in the joint announcement on the results of the Washington meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

[Vedenyapin] Yet now here we have Kampelman saying that a treaty on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms can only be signed if the sides renounce all limitations on sea-based cruise missiles—in other words, violate the obligations they themselves undertook about 6 months ago. That, then, is the turn of events that the head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks is trying to bring about. Really, a 180-degree turn.

[Volskiy] It's quite indicative what arguments Kampelman himself offers in support of all this. In his opinion, everything turns on the problem of verification [kontrol]. And, says the Washington diplomat, it cannot be asserted that sea-based cruise missiles are not susceptible to monitoring: We need to look for the technical means to carry out monitoring. That, he claims, will take time. And until the United States finds such means, they won't agree to limit the number of sea-based cruise missiles, although it's pertinent to say that the Soviet side asserts that the necessary technical means already exist. It is perfectly obvious, however, that without having solved the problem of this type of cruise missiles, we cannot conclude a treaty on strategic offensive arms.

[Vedenyapin] You can see that as humanity tackles its problems, its road is not an easy one. This also naturally—or, to be more exact, regrettably—applies to regional problems, and, in particular, to one of the most acute: the problem of Afghanistan.

[Volskiy] Yes, Afghanistan is currently going through what is undoubtedly a crucial moment. Much is still unclear about its destiny, despite the fact that almost 2 and ½ months have already passed since the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and around 1 and ½ months since the start of the pullout of Soviet troops from there. One thing is clear at the moment: Those decisions, the Geneva agreements, have exerted a beneficial influence both on the situation in Afghanistan and the international situation as a whole, and they continue to do so. But domestic political development in Afghanistan has not yet been determined. The war within the country has not ended. Extremist opposition circles are even attempting to take advantage of the start of the Soviet troop pullout to step up military operations against the government army.

[Vedenyapin] Dmitriy Antonovich, I know you were in Afghanistan recently, and you were no doubt able to form an opinion about the sort of correlation of domestic forces there is there at the moment.

[Volskiy] It is of course not that easy to reply to this question. Developments, so to speak, will evidently throw light on the reply one should give. But here is what I think can be said even now. The assertions by the leaders of the rebels, the extremist wing of the opposition, that they are achieving pretty well one military victory over government troops after another as Soviet troops are being withdrawn, are mendacious and intended to serve just a single purpose: to create an impression in the outside world, and above all, in the United States. If something strikes you now when you look at the situation in Afghanistan, it is the exact reverse: Not these fictitious victories, but the courage and doggedness with which government troops are fighting the rebels. It now seems to be that as our contingent leaves, the Afghan Government Army is demonstrating greater combat ability, and perhaps a higher fighting spirit, than before. Moreover, the regular troops are not the only ones that are ready for defense, but there are also the other defenders of the April Revolution, drawn from the civilian population.

What does this show? Above all, that the mistakes committed after the revolution are now being rectified not in words but in action, and this is exerting a definite influence on the minds of the Afghan people. For instance, it was not long ago when the agrarian reform was being pushed through in an unjustified way and the traditions and customs of this ancient country ignored. Now this sort of behavior is a thing of the past. It has been abandoned. At the same time, increasing respect is being shown to Islam. For instance, a theology faculty has been set up at Kabul University. Yet in the period

immediately following the revolution, attempts had been made to clamp down on the Islamic religion and clergymen,and this had turned very many believers—and the majority in the country—against the revolution. Unjustified measures had also been taken against the private sector in the economy. Now every possible endeavor is made to involve the private sector in the restoration of the country's economic organism, which has been undermined by war, and in the building of the national economy.

[Vedenyapin] In a word, if one were to sum up all this, one should probably say that all this is connected directly with the policy of national reconciliation, the policy being pursued by the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan.

[Volskiy] Quite so. The connection is obvious here. The widening of the social base of the regime is inseparable from the policy of national reconciliation. And the policy itself also has an effect on the correlation of forces inside Afghanistan, which we talked about. The opposition circles which have not been based in Pakistan or Iran, but in Delhi, say, where they are free in their decisions and not subject to external pressures, have responded to the policy of national reconciliation. In Kabul, I had occasion to meet representatives of these circles. At the time, they did not accept the April Revolution, but they see the policy of national reconciliation as acceptable to them. Many of them are already returning to Afghanistan, where they are engaging in political activity. The same can be said of certain emigres in the United States and other Western countries. In this regard, many supporters of the former Afghan King, Zaher Shah, who is currently living in a villa in a Rome suburb, are even being named. Quite broad circles in Afghanistan look to him as a kind of symbol of the unity of the country, and President Najibullah has told us that his place in the coalition administration, the place of the king, will only be determined by the people in a democratic manner. Mind you, as far as Zaher Shah himself is concerned, he currently avoids all specific political declarations.

[Vedenyapin] But the leaders of the extremist wing of the opposition, based in Peshawar, are not, as far as I am aware, avoiding such declarations. They openly reject the policy of reconciliation, they talk of a military campaign against Kabul and a few days ago in Peshawar, they even announced the setting up of some kind of provisional government.

[Volskiy] Yes, this provisional government—two circumstances are noteworthy. First, no place was found on Afghan territory for this proclamation: It was made on Pakistani territory. This is no coincidence because the opposition has no firm control over any region or even simply any large part of Afghan soil, or any town. There is nowhere in Afghanistan for it to proclaim its government or to site it. This is despite all its bragging about military successes. That is the first point. Second, the government includes only opposition politicians, the leaders of the groupings who live in Peshawar, and travel around the whole world obtaining financial and military aid for themselves, while the commanders of the armed detachments of the opposition, the rebel commanders, who are directly involved in the war against government troops on Afghan territory, were not included in the government. Nor is this fortuitous because a serious struggle for power is under way between the politicians who have entrenched themselves in Peshawar and the so-called opposition commanders on the spot—the band chieftains, so to speak. Indeed, altogether the commanders on the spot, who are at the head of armed groups that are in the very thick of it, who personally experience the horrors of war and who are running up against the strength of the government army, have in many cases a much more positive attitude toward the policy of national reconciliation. On the basis of their own experience, they are experiencing what its rejection means.

[Vedenyapin] It is no secret that within the ranks of the Peshawar Seven, there are other contradictions too between Islamic fanatics—fundamentalist fanatics—who want to establish a Muslim regime in Afghanistan after the pattern of Iran and more moderate groupings.

[Volskiy] It is indeed considered that three of the seven groups based in Peshawar—that is the opposition groups parties or organizations, call them waht you will—three of these seven belong among the moderates, while four are among the fundamentalists. Among the latter, the most influential group is that of the notorious Hekmatyar, which receives up to 40 percent of all U.S. aid to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries. However, the parallel with Iran seems to me in this respect, nevertheless, highly relative. The reason is that the majority of Afghan fundamentalists are not Shi'a Muslims, as in Iran, but Sunni muslims, and they are oriented to Pakistan where the Sunni persuasion of Islam predominates. An interesting detail is the fact that the groupings based in Iran have formally declined to recognize the so-called government in exile that was formed in Peshawar. One should also bear in mind that inside Afghanistan, fanatical Muslim fundamentalism runs into opposition not only because it goes counter to the norms of presentday life and the requirements of socioeconomic development. It is not just for this reason that it is meeting a rebuff. It is for another reason too. It runs counter to the ancient customs and traditional tribal structure of Afghan society. This accounts for the potential weakness of the opposition's extremist wing.

[Vedenyapin] A further question that arises here, Dmitriy Antonovich, is this. What, nevertheless, is prompting Pakistan, precisely Pakistan, contrary to the Geneva agreements to interfere in the affairs of Afghanistan and in essence to help prolong the bloodshed there?

[Volskiy] Well, I would specify the following facts. First, the Pakistan military regime calculates that this course will ensure for itself continued U.S. assistance in money and weapons and also—as I would formulate it—silent

nonresistance on the U.S. part to Pakistan's nuclear preparations, about which information is seeping into the press. Second, Ziaul Haq and his circle are plainly hatching certain expansionist aspirations with regard to Afghanistan, and Hekmatyar and those like him are playing along with this. Third, the Pakistan regime wants to divert attention from its internal political difficulties and the contradictions that are at present rending apart this country itself. But in the final analysis, this course is boomeranging on Pakistan itself. Not for nothing did Ziaul Haq recently dismiss the ministerial cabinet headed by Junejo, who according to some reports, realized the danger to the country of its anti-Afghan course and advocated compliance with the Geneva agreements.

[Vedenyapin] I would note the fact that there has not been a single statesman or politician that does not welcome the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from there, which began over a month ago. I am of course not taking into account here the position of the so-called Peshawar Seven. We have already mentioned that position and it is well known.

Indeed, the continuing withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan was welcomed also by the participants in the economic conference in the Canadian city of Toronto, which ended this week. It was there that the leaders of the seven leading industrial powers of the capitalist world assembled—namely, Canada, the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, and Japan. Nevertheless, one's attention is drawn to the following. The authors of the Political Declaration that was published after the meeting in essence completely ignored the indisputable truth that a settlement of the Afghan problem is possible only, indeed, with the strict observance of all the provisions of the Geneva agreements by all the sides which signed them.

[Volskiy] Yes, it is a position of deliberate silence. It shows a reluctance to take account of the essential realities of the present day which might ensure a genuine settlement of the Afghanistan situation.

[Andrianov] All this is, unfortunately, an obvious fact. However, now that we have begun speaking of the meeting of the Capitalist Seven, I think its results merit our dwelling on them separately. After all, it is well known that this kind of meeting occurs only once a year. The conference in Toronto was the 14th such meeting, and it should be noted that it differed somewhat from previous ones. Whereas the previous meetings were willy-nilly accompanied by a display of deep contradictions among their participants, the present one proved to be surprisingly tranquil. Incidentally, it should be said that this is how it had been planned to be right from the outset. There were several reasons for this. The fact is that of late, some positive trends have been discernible in the world economy; none of the participants in the Toronto meeting wanted to overcast the optimistic mood. Therefore, they preferred there to to emphasize their spheres of agreement and not to overemphasize the knots of contradictions.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, evidently none of this group of seven wanted for the umpteenth time to make promises that are known in advance to be unrealizable or throw up their hands at the impossibility of resolving a problem which anyway will inevitably be transferred from the agenda of one meeting to the agenda of the following one. I think that the economics professor at Yale University, Tobin, had grounds for warning that nothing substantial would happen at Toronto, but to make up for it, there would be a lot of mutual congratulations and farewell speeches to Reagan. Here's another reason for such unusual harmony for you. In January next year, the present U.S. President will leave his post, and, therefore, his colleagues in the group of seven decided not to cast gloom over the atmosphere of Reagan's send-off.

[Volskiy] But one ought not to assume, of course, that the meeting of the leaders of the Seven in the Toronto Convention Center bore the nature of some kind of social gathering. Not at all. In the underground hall, nicknamed The Bunker by the journalists, a both serious and thorough talk was conducted on the problems of the world economy. They also discussed bilateral relations between the countries represented at Toronto, as well as their relations with other states, particularly as the leaders of the Seven do not have the opportunity all that often to meet in such an unofficial atmosphere. If no sensations were expected from the discussions in the economics sphere, the Political Declaration proved to be, one has to be frank, exceptional. Even in its present contradictory form, it would still hardly have been possible even something like year ago. The adopted declaration stresses in particular—this was noted by a correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES—an acknowledgement of the importance of the changes in relations with Moscow since the time that the preceeding economic meeting of the Seven was held in Venice. Also, the Japanese newspaper MAINICHI evaluated the Political Declaration as an incentive for dialogue between the East and West.

[Andrianov] I think there is a grain of truth in these assessments. All the same, when one familiarizes oneself with the text of the Declaration, one cannot escape from the impression that this document is made up of two unequal and, in many ways, opposing parts. The first part of the Declaration is perhaps indeed written in the language of today. Displayed in it are even the first outlines of the new political thinking, the very same that was demonstrated to the full during the Moscow summit meeting, and the process of drawing up and adopting the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

[Vedenyapin] I shall add that the declaration has reflected the fairly sensitive reaction of the West to the processes going in our Soviet society. Each one of us, the

document states, will respond positively to such a development of events. The participants at the meeting were also agreed that a constructive and realistic dialogue and cooperation, including on arms control issues, respect for human rights and resolving regional problems, are means for establishing stability and security in the world. In Toronto, they also approved the progress achieved by the Soviet Union and the United States in the sphere of nuclear arms reduction. The Seven deemed it necessary to congratulate personally both the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President on achieving the goal set.

[Andrianov] Alongside this in the Political Declaration, more than enough space is taken up by the old stereotypes. One need only mention, for example, the assertion that the nuclear deterent strategy will remain the guarantor of peace and tranquility in the foreseeable future.

[Volskiy] Well, of course it is apparent that the new thinking is having difficulty making headway in the West. But nonetheless, the very fact that it was disarmament issues that became the focus of the political discussion in Toronto, in light of the recent talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, just this in itself indicates a lot. The new political thinking is becoming an increasingly influential, even if not openly expressed, factor at the negotiating table of Western statesmen.

[Vedenyapin] But the leading French television channel, TF-1, put it even more succinctly, I would say. According to it, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev became the real eighth participant at the Toronto meeting. A correspondent of the U.S. television company NBC, in his reportage from Canada, stressed that the Western leaders had paid tribute to the reforms of the general secretary of CPSU Central Committee.

[Andrianov] An economic declaration was also adopted on the last day of the Seven's work that was read out by Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney. Special emphasis in this document is laid precisely on the positive trends in the development of the capitalist economy over recent years. The Western leaders were patently trying to reassure the world financial markets, taking into account the very strong shocks that the stock markets in capitalist capitals have been experiencing as a result of the fall in the U.S. dollar exchange rate. The protracted and unhealthy problems of the capitalist world also found reflection in the economic declaration. I mean the huge budget and trade deficit of the United States, unemployment in Western Europe: It stands at 11 percent of the whole of the population capable of working. I am also referring to the disagreements between the Western partners regarding agricultural subsidies, the huge foreign debt of countries in the so-called Third World, and other acute problems. However the participants of the Toronto meeting were patently not seeking for keys to resolve them. Therefore, the economic declaration is confined in this respect merely to calls for cooperation and united efforts.

[Vedenyapin] On that, we end our roundtable meeting. All those taking part, thank you for your attention, esteemed radio listeners. Goodbye, all the best to you.

United States & Canada

Spokesman Scores VOA Charges on Afghanistan

PM2706111588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Correspondent G. Deyev report: "Mines on Roads. From Our Correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A briefing has been held for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. A Foreign Ministry spokesman delivered a statement there.

It regretfully has to be stated, he said, that forces which do dirty political business on torpedoing the fulfillment of the Geneva agreements and on fanning psychological warfare against the Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union are continuing their propaganda sallies. A recent VOA commentary is an example of this. Grossly distorting the facts, the radio station tries, no less, to shift onto the Soviet Union the entire responsibility for the Afghan people's suffering as a result of the undeclared war unleashed against them by the armed opposition and to impute to us the perfidious, villainous terrorist acts which antigovernment groupings are committing against peaceful Afghan residents.

It is a question, in particular, of the massive mining of Afghan territory, of boobytrapped mines. We have already repeatedly used numerous specific facts to show the world public who is really mining roads, placing mines in apartment blocks, mosques, and places where people gather, and scattering toys stuffed with explosives. We have shown on television shots featuring so-called fighters for the faith who were caught red-handed on the scene of their villainous crimes, including with boobytrapped mines. And what can be said about the continuing firing of rockets at Kabul and other Afghan cities and population centers? At the same time, there are no facts—and there can be none—confirming that a Soviet soldier was behind such criminal deeds.

It is perfectly obvious that all the slanderous fabrications against the Soviet limited military contingent are designed not only to draw a veil over the rebels' crimes but to draw world public attention away from the problems of achieving an all-embracing Afghan settlement and from Pakistan's gross violation of the Geneva agreements.

Unlike VOA, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized, we do not resort to falsification, and what we say is corroborated by concrete evidence. Here are recent facts which I would like to cite in addition to what we have said earlier.

The Pakistani authorities use their own Army transport to move weapons and ammunition from dumps of the Pakistani Armed Forces' 12th Corps to the Tubya transshipment base, from where they are forwarded to rebels in the Qandahar, Helmand, and Ghowr Provinces. During the first half of June the Pakistani Army delivered a large quantity of heavy weapons to Tubya.

Antigovernment forces have begun to receive motor vehicles with enhanced cross-country capacity equipped with large-caliber machineguns. Up to 500 of these vehicles are concentrated at a dump in Quetta.

Rays Khalil and Mullah Manon, representatives of the "Alliance of the Seven," arrived in Parvan Province from Peshawar 20 June. Their aim is to form a new 500-600 man-strong regiment of the "Islamic Party of Afghanistan." U.S. clothing has been delivered there.

Some 25 U.S., Pakistani, and French advisers have also arrived in Parvan Province (the village of Chamalwarda) from Pakistan to join Ahmad Shah Mas'ud's formations.

The transfer of 12 armed groups of 100 men each to the control of detachments of the "Islamic Society of Afghanistan" in the Zebak region has begun.

Rebels of the "Islamic Society of Afghanistan" operating in Herat Province were sent 20 million afghanis from Peshawar 16 June.

A "volunteer corps" up to 3,000 men strong has begun to be formed in Pakistan on the basis of the rebels' border regiments.

During 18 through 20 June alone there were 31 shellings of Afghan cities and population centers, in which 9 people died and 32 peaceful inhabitants were injured. During shelling of Qandahar by rebels 20 June a rocket exploded on the territory of a school. As a result, two schoolchildren were killed and five injured. This is no longer war; it is terrorism.

It must be clear to everyone now why the Pakistani authorities are doing their utmost to paralyze the inspection activity of UN observers on Pakistani territory, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said in conclusion.

Canada Expulsions 'Unprovoked Insult'

PM2706144388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Foreign Policy and Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] Soviet foreign policy is at the stage of active restructuring—which makes it possible to create favorable external conditions for implementing transformations inside the country. This was emphasized at a 25 June news conference in the press center of the 19th all-union party conference. [passage omitted]

The leadership of Canada sins by old thinking, Yu.M. Vorontsov declared, replying to a question concerning the expulsion of Soviet diplomats from Canada. It was a quite unprovoked insult which must elicit a reaction. The Soviet Union is a great power which cannot let itself be insulted in this way and insulted with impunity. It is incomprehensible why all this is necessary, he said, commenting on the Canadian authorities' unjustified decision. [passage omitted]

China

PRC Premier Li Cited on Peace Prospects

PM2806085588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "War Can Be Avoided"]

[Text] Beijing, 22 Jun—China welcomes the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations, Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, stated in the talks taking place here during the visit by Ethiopian President Mengistu Haile Mariam.

The PRC believes, the Chinese leader said, that although the danger of war still exists, thanks to the growth of peace-loving forces throughout the world, and also as a result of decisive actions by countries and peoples fighting for the cause of peace, a world war can be avoided. A certain easing in the world situation is taking place, the PRC State Council premier stressed, but people advocating peace throughout the world must not relax their vigilance. Arms reduction, and particularly the reduction of nuclear arms, is a very difficult matter. At the same time, there are many "troublespots" in the world. As far as China is concerned, it pursues a peaceful, independent foreign policy and hopes for a peaceful international environment for a long time to come.

On behalf of the Chinese Government, Li Peng condemned the South African authorities for their apartheid policy and stated its support for the independence struggle by the peoples of the "Frontline" States in southern Africa.

Restructuring Breaks Decade of Stagnation

OW2606164088 Beijing XINHUA in English 1543 GMT 26 Jun 88

["Roundup: Progress, Problems in Soviet Perestroyka Process"—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Moscow, June 26 (XINHUA)—The Soviet Union's perestroyka (restructuring) drive, initialed three years ago by Mikhail Gorbachev, has broken a decade-long stagnation of the economy, but with new problems cropping up.

In Moscow streets today, one can see changes that were unthinkable before the restructuring process began.

One can see private taxi drivers vying with each other for passengers, crowds of young people buying fashionable dresses at hundreds of booths on the square in front of the riga railway station, and smoke curling up from private stands selling roast meat, whose selling prices are usually 10 times higher than those at state-run shops.

Reform has brought about a breakthrough in changing people's attitudes toward the concept of ownership and production.

With the introduction of reform policies, people agree today that whether management, sizes of enterprises or forms of ownership should be diversified. [as received]

Along with the changes in the traditional conception of ownership, there have appeared in Leningrad large-scale chemical and dynamic machinery concerns. For instance, the ocular micro-operation research institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences has been allowed to operate on the basis of a leasing system. Some enterprises have begun circulating stocks, while the household contract-system has been introduced in many rural areas.

Beginning this year, as many as 11 bills on reforms, including legislation on state-run enterprises, on cooperatives and on individual labor, are gradually taking effect, providing reforms with legal foundations.

In the first five months of this year, the national income went up five percent and industrial production and the national economy both met their targets. Labor productivity increased by 6 percent and the goal for commodity circulation met for the first time in memory.

However, just as the Thesis of the Communist Party's upcoming national conference put it: "A fundamental turn for the better has not been achieved in the development of the Soviet economy."

Because reform policies have been based on the country's 12th 5-Year Plan, which is in line with its antiquated economic structure, both old and new economic systems are co-existing and functioning, resulting in notable contradictions.

So, what is the way out?

One view suggested that targets set in the current 5-year plan be lowered so as to guarantee the smooth implementation of reforms, but others disagreed with this suggestion, saying that the Soviet Union had failed to fulfill many 5-year plans in the past, and that people would lose faith in the reform drive if the current 5-year plan again failed.

There are other proposals.

Because the old concept of economic growth, which emphasizes quantity, is still operating, government ministries, under the name of state purchasing, continue to assign obligatory production orders to their subordinate enterprises.

In an effort to cover up the fact that some enterprises lose huge amounts, authorities deduct part of the profit from well-managed enterprises and give it to loss-making enterprises, bringing profit to the same level. This greatly hurts the initiative for profitable enterprises to improve management.

According to recent official reports here, investment has increased and restrictions on policies loosed in a bid to tap the potential of the contract system based on leasing. However, this cannot be expected to bring about immediate results.

Nie Dajiang Leads Radio, Television Delegation

Group Tours Tashkent

LD2406124088 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] A staff delegation from the PRC Ministry of Radio, Cinema, and Television is becoming acquainted with life in our republic and the work of Uzbekistan's mass media. It is headed by Nie Dajiang, first deputy minister of radio, cinema, and television.

Yesterday the guests were received by Comrade Sultanova, deputy chairperson of the Uzbek Council of Ministers. They also visited the Uzbek SSR State Committee for Radio and Television. They were familiarized with how the processes of perestroyka and democratization in all aspects of life in Soviet society are being reported in broadcasts of the republic's radio and television. The delegation members saw the sights of Tashkent and visited the capital's subway system.

Protocol Signed

LD2806082488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A protocol for cooperation in the field of television and radio broadcasting between the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the PRC Ministry of Radio, Cinema, and Television for 1989-1990 was signed in Moscow today. The document provides for further cooperation and expansion in the exchange of television and radio materials about the life of the Soviet Union and the PRC:

[Begin recording of Nie Dajiang, first vice minister of PRC radio, cinema, and television, identified by screen caption, speaking in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation] We signed the first protocol for 30 years in Beijing last year on cooperation between the PRC and the Soviet Union in the field of television and radio broadcasting. Today's document continues the work that has been begun and is certainly a step in the right direction. It will promote the deepening of bilateral links and will fill them with new content. In developing our contacts, we base our views on the fact that television and radio, which play a very great role in the life of society, will help us get to know and understand one another better, and will promote the expansion of cooperation between our countries in very many fields. [end recording]

Further on PRC Youth Federation's Visit

Talk With Chelnokov

OW2806015288 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] The delegation of the All-China Youth Federation, which is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR, returned to Moscow on 16 June after visiting various places in our country. On the morning of 16 June, members of the delegation laid wreaths before Lenin's tomb at Red Square and the tomb of the unknown martyrs at the Kremlin.

On the same day, Chelnokov, chairman of the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR, met the Chinese youth delegation and discussed cooperation problems between the two organizations and their subordinate units. At the meeting, a proposal was made on the establishment of direct contacts between the Soviet College Students Federation and the All-China Students Federation. (Zhaizai), chairman of the Soviet College Students Federation, told a station reporter that this kind of cooperation will include exchanging visits of college student construction teams and student study groups to exchange work information and experience. On the evening of 16 June, the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR held a reception party for the Chinese youth delegation.

Youth Leader on Gromyko Meeting

OW2806052788 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 19 Jun 88

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, as we have reported, a delegation of the All-China Youth Federation is currently on a formal visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR. The delegation is headed by Comrade Liu Yandong, president of the All-China Youth Federation. During a visit to Leningrad and the Georgia SSR, the delegation visited some industrial enterprises and schools and met with some youths. On 17 June, Liu Yandong was received at the Kremlin Palace by Gromyko, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. In their talks, Liu Yandong pointed out that the visit has enabled the delegation to

better understand the nature of the profound changes in the Soviet Union and to feel the Soviet people's sincere friendship and interest in the Chinese people. A station reporter interviewed Liu Yandong and asked her to say a few words about her meeting with Gromyko. She said:

[Begin rec -ding] Comrade Gromyko met with our delegation. We feel that because Comrade Gromyko, as chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, took time to meet us despite his tight work schedule, it shows that he attached great importance to the visit of the All-China Youth Federation delegation to the Soviet Union. Comrade Gromyko extensively and systematically briefed the delegation on the USSR's current international and domestic policies. He particularly briefed us on the current reforms in the Soviet Union and on the forthcoming 19th all-union party conference. He also hoped that Chinese and Soviet youths would further develop their friendly relations, and he extended his good wishes to the Chinese people and youths. I feel that the talks were conducted in a very cordial and friendly atmosphere. As I know it, because of his tight work schedule, Comrade Gromyko usually meets with a delegation for only an hour or so. However, he talked with us for an hour and 40 minutes yesterday. This was rather unusual, and it shows how he assessed the meeting. We are very happy that we were able to meet Comrade Gromyko during our visit here. We will convey to the Chinese people and youths the Soviet people's friendship and their good wishes to the Chinese people as expressed by Comrade Gromyko. [end recording]

Soviet television carried live the meeting between Gromyko and the Chinese youth delegation at the Kremlin. Soviet newspapers also reported on the meeting.

Vedernikov Receives Metallurgists Delegation

PM2606095188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reception of Metallurgists"]

[Text] G.G. Vedernikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received a group of PRC metallurgists headed by Qi Yuanjing, PRC minister of the metallurgical industry, 23 June.

During the talk, which was held in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding, questions of the expansion of cooperation between the USSR and the PRC in the sphere of ferrous metallurgy were discussed, as were questions of increasing the profitability of ferrous metallurgy enterprises and improving the technical standard of metal products.

[IZVESTIYA Morning Edition for the same date carries on page 4 an otherwise identical TASS report which replaces the above paragraph with one reading:

The delegation of Chinese metallurgists was in the Soviet Union 12 through 23 June at the invitation of the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy. While in the USSR the PRC Ministry of the Metallurgical Industry delegation visited a number of metallurgical and mining enterprises and planning and scientific research institutes.]

Trade Union Leader Interviewed on Reforms

LD2506214088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 25 Jun 88

[Excerpts] [Announcer] I would like to draw your attention to a report from Beijing sent to us by Vladimir Kulikov. It is, as you will now see, devoted once again to the problem of restructuring, but not in the economy—in trade union activity.

[Kulikov] Han Kai is one of China's popular trad. union figures. He is now the head of the capital's Federation of Trade Unions. [passage omitted] My conversation with him was entirely devoted to what is new in the trade union reforms under way in China. Thanks to the reforms, says Han Kai, people's political activity has undergone an unusual increase, not just among party members but among the broad masses of the people. It is natural that the trade unions which unite our working class, white collar workers, and intelligentsia have not remained aloof from this. Elections of trade union leaders are taking place everywhere and taking place democratically. Leaders today can no longer make decisions and ignore the view of the trade unions, as was the case in the past. The basis for this active work by the trade unions is the provision advanced at the 13th CPC Congress, said Han Kai. This provision says that the workers—the working class—are the owners of the enterprise. Once this is so, the trade union organization expressing the interests of the workers must play the same role. [passage omitted]

Gu Chen Mao, a rubber manufacturing plant director says: There is nothing offensive in the fact that the working class monitors the director's work. A plant manager commented, saying: The administrative and economic decisions that used to be made by the party committee and the administration's ability to organize production, along with the role of the trade union as an organization that obediently stamps decisions made somewhere else, are all becoming things of the past.

Shirayev Eyes Light Industry's 'Bright Future'

OW2806015688 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 15 Jun 88

[By station observer Shirayev]

[Excerpts] Bilateral cooperation in light industry is based on an agreement signed in 1985. This agreement specifies China's projects in building and renovating plants with the help of the Soviet Union, including the Harbin Flax Mill. The work of renovating this mill has already started. The Soviet Union has supplied a large number of

equipment. A contract has also been signed for the Soviet Union to supply the necessary equipment in renovating the flax mills in Jiamusi, Suihua, Zhaodong, and Huanan.

The cooperation between the Soviet Union and China in light industry has become closer and is on an even larger scale. A responsible person of the Soviet State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations said: In the second part of May this year, Chinese and Soviet experts held forums in Beijing, Tianjin, and Harbin at which new Soviet technology in flax and cotton fiber processing and modern Soviet textile equipment were introduced. Representatives from more than 20 enterprises and designing and scientific research institutes in Harbin attended the Harbin forum at which the Soviet experts introduced Soviet achievements in developing fiber processing; some Chinese enterprises decided to buy new Soviet technology in light industry. [passage omitted]

Not long ago, contracts worth 100 million rubles were signed. This year, China will provide the Soviet Union with 4 million meters of silk, 25 million towels, 300,000 woolen blankets, 10 million meters of cotton cloth, and other textile products. All these Chinese products are welcomed by Soviet customers. On the other hand, the Soviet Union will provide China with modern textile equipment. The cooperation between the two countries in light industry indeed has a bright future.

Assembly of People's Representatives Opens

LD2606110888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 26 Jun 88

[Text] The latest session of the standing committee of the All-China Assembly of People's Representatives has opened in Beijing. It is to consider a draft law to reform the Chinese Army. The PRC Central Military Council proposed restoring the military ranks abolished in 1966 during the so-called cultural revolution. Deputies have heard a response on the implementation of the country's state budget for 1987.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for Cambodian Settlement Viewed

PM2706122788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Morning Edition p4

[Own correspondent B. Vinogradov "International Commentary" under the Facts, Events, Opinions" rubric: "Through Dialogue to Stability"]

[Text] Hanoi—This summer promises to be filled with important events which will exert beneficial influence on the settlement of the problems around Cambodia. The prospects for eliminating one of the most tense regional conflicts, which has persisted for many years now in the Southeast Asia region, are emerging increasingly clearly. The foreign mass media see grounds for this assertion primarily in the positive example of Afghanistan, which has provided a scheme for a real way out of a difficult situation while respecting the interests of the sides drawn into the conflict. Of course, each specific case may have its own features in the normalization process and its own variations, but serious observers and politicians agree on one thing: The "Afghan way," as a manifestation of the new thinking, shows a specific prospect for restoring peace for all who are interested in it.

The accord between the SRV and PRK Governments on the withdrawal of 50,000 Vietnamese volunteers and their command from Cambodian territory this year is viewed as a major new step in the direction of the peaceful settlement of the situation around Cambodia. The resolve of Vietnam and Cambodia to complete the complete withdrawal of troops in 1990 remains unaltered. All this is convincing evidence of the existence of goodwill on the part of the two fraternal countries to travel their part of the way to peace and stability in the region. This policy is meeting with merited approval and understanding from the international public.

But there are also other forces on which the success of the normalization of the situation and the prospect of creating a zone of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation in Southeast Asia depend to a considerable degree. In this connection great interest is generated by the forthcoming "informal," as journalists call it, meeting in the Indonesian city of Bogor between representatives of the PRK Government and the three opposition Cambodian groupings—of Prince Sihanouk, Son Sann, and the "Khmers Rouges." As is well known, it was Vietnam and Indonesia, which represent respectively two groups of countries—Indochina and ASEAN—which came out with the initiative for this meeting. Thus a talk between representatives of all interested Cambodian forces to examine possibilities of national conciliation should be held for the first time. Of course, it is hard to expect great results from this exchange of opinions—the positions of the sides involved are still too different—but the very fact that it is to take place undoubtedly has important significance.

It is expected that at the second stage of these talks Vietnam and Indonesia and other Southeast Asian states will join them. The successful talks which were conducted recently in Bangkok by SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach and his Thai counterpart Sitthi Sawetsila can also be regarded as a guarantee of further progress in the search for mutual understanding and constructive cooperation between the countries of the region. During the dialogue several viewpoints were successfully brought closer on questions of both bilateral and international relations which, by common assessment, should be a substantial contribution to the settlement process.

In weighing all the factors influencing the development of events in the region, observers note that the positive trend toward peace and dialogue brought to life by the

new thinking in world politics is blazing a trail increasingly confidently. In this context the development of Soviet-Chinese relations should also be viewed as a stabilizing factor. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union and China can effectively promote the unblocking of the situation around Cambodia. As for our country, it has always invariably supported any steps leading to peace and good-neighborliness both in Southeast Asia and throughout the Asian and Pacific region.

SRV Premier Do Muoi Congratulated

PM2606094588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Council of Ministers greetings message "to Comrade Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Do Muoi,

We cordially congratulate you on your election as chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers and we wish you great successes and fruitful work in this responsible state post.

The Soviet Union firmly supports the efforts of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV], the SRV Government, and Vietnamese working people in implementing the course outlined by the Sixth CPV Congress of renewal in various spheres of society's life. Implementation of this course will undoubtedly promote the successful resolution of the tasks of Vietnam's socioeconomic development and the country's acceleration down the road of socialist creation.

We are convinced that the bonds of fraternal friendship and all-around cooperation between the Soviet Union and the SRV will continue to steadily strengthen for the good of our countries' peoples and in the interests of the cause of peace and social progress.

The USSR Council of Ministers

Vietnamese Communist Party Plenum Reported

PM2606101188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Hanoi, 21 Jun—During the extremely important stage of revolutionary renewal through whichh the country is going, it is important to strengthen the party in every way and to enhance its leading and organizational role. This is said in an official report issued here on the CPV [Communist Party of Vietnam] Central Committee plenum held 14 through 20 June, which discussed vital questions concerning party building. Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, delivered a speech to the plenum.

As the plenum noted, the party and its leading organs have made considerable efforts to implement the course of renewal in the period since the Sixth CPV Congress. A spirit of democracy and open criticism and self-criticism is developing in the party and society. A partial reorganization of the apparatus has been carried out, and work style and methods are improving. Nevertheless, acute socioeconomic difficulties persist in the country and numerous negative phenomena are observable in the life of the party and society. The CPV Central Committee Politburo decision to launch a mass movement to cleanse the ranks and make party organizations and the state apparatus more dynamic is not being carried out energetically enough everywhere and its results have been limited.

Work in the sphere of party building must be closely coordinated with the implementation of vital socioeconomic tasks and the struggle to improve social relations. A rational reorganization of the apparatus and redeployment of cadres, particularly those in key posts, should be carried out, plenum participants stressed. It is essential to broaden democracy, strictly observe the principle of democratic centralism, restore order and discipline, step up criticism and self-criticism, strengthen the unity of the party and its ties with the masses, and fight bureaucracy.

A decision was adopted that during elections to party committees, including the party Central Committee, one-third of their members must be replaced. A party committee secretary must not remain in his post for more than 10 years.

The plenum examined organizational questions. CPV Central Committee Secretary Dao Duy Tung was promoted from candidate to full member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo. Ha Trong Hoa, secretary of Thanh Hoa Province CPV Committee, was removed from the party Central Committee for mistakes in his work.

Australia's Hawke Condemns U.S. Trade Policy

LD2406091288 Moscow TASS in English 0854 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 24 TASS—Australian Prime Minister Robert Hawke, who is paying an official working visit to the United States, met President Reagan in the White House Thursday and also spoke at the joint session of the two chambers of the U.S. Congress.

During their talk Reagan and Hawke discussed the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow, the course of the debate at the economic summit of the leaders of seven leading countries of the capitalist world in Toronto, regional issues and matters of bilateral relations.

Commenting on the outcome of Hawke's talks in the White House, U.S. Administration officials intensively emphasize an excellent nature of the current political

and military contacts between Washington and Canberra. They are compelled to admit, however, that there are serious economic disagreements between the United States and Australia.

Hawke declared for the United States' vigorous involvement in the affairs of the Asia and Pacific regions and for preserving the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. Hawke's tone, however, took an about-face when he went over to world trade problems. He strongly denounced U.S. subsidies to encourage the export of American farm produce.

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Pessimism on Future, Party Unity Viewed

PM2706131388 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 23 Jun 88 p 3

[Special correspondent Yu. Kirpichnikov dispatch under the rubric "From the Afghan Notebook": "People, War, Life"]

[Excerpts] Kabul, Moscow—At the "Kabul" Hotel, the Western journalistic fraternity was sounding the death knell of the April Revolution. The chattering teleprinters were hammering out the same kind of messages in a multitude of languages: "The communists' chances of survival are nil." "Half a million mujahiddin are waiting in the suburbs for D-Day to storm the capital." And the menacing refrain: "An inevitable bloodbath will follow!"

I do not want to cast aspersions on all my Western colleagues who had taken over the hotel. There were decent people among them. But in most of them I did not detect a shred of human compassion. At best indifference, but more often a malicious delight at other people's misfortune and an impatient desire to gloat over it which were so blatant as to be indecent.

Being Able To Defend Oneself [subhead]

Many a time I had to listen to the question, asked with feigned concern but in subtly mocking tones: "What are you doing, are you abandoning Afghanistan to its fate?" I thought I had learned to answer it with composure. Nonetheless, I felt a sharp pain in my heart and my eyes grew moist when an old peasant from whom I had just bought some mandarins passed them to me with his sun-scorched hand, marked with deep furrows like the ground after a prolonged drought, and said unexpectedly: "I am a simple man. I do not understand politics. Since you are leaving, I take it that it has to be. But I have a son in the Army. He told me that even with you, we could not win. What will he say now?"

The "Volga" was speeding down the embankment of the river which had risen as a result of the heavy rains. Life in the winding little streets, the small street stalls, and behind the mud walls is very different from that to which we are accustomed. I was haunted by the questioning parting glance of the peasant. Suddenly I was acutely aware that thousands of our friends whom we are leaving behind on the sharp dividing line between life and death, between loyalty to the revolution and the betrayal of its cause, are looking at our backs with the eyes of that peasant. From now on the destiny of their motherland depends on them. Will they be able to cope? Are they ready to accept the heavy responsibility which our servicemen had shared with them?

"They are ready," Fakhri, chief editor of HAQIQAT-E SARBAZ, the central organ of the Army, the militia, and the security forces, believes. A smallish man with lively, attentive eyes and a handsome, sensitive face, he received us in an ascetically modest office in which a splendid bouquet of flowers provided an incongruous splash of color. In excellent Russian, the general went on: "Up to the last minute, many people did not believe that the agreements would be signed. Now that they are a reality. It is necessary to act accordingly. Naturally, the withdrawal of the Soviet forces makes our task of defending the revolution more complicated. But I will say frankly, it is time for the Afghan Army to stand on its own feet. It is no secret that attitudes of dependence were developing in the Army, a desire to sit it out under your protection. Today we are stronger than 2 years ago. Discipline has strengthened and the personnel's political consciousness has risen."

The armed opposition has sharply stepped up its missile attacks on Kabul of late. What is your view of this?

"The opposition is still very strong, of course. Nonetheless, the increasing frequency of the attacks on the capital is reminiscent of"—the general paused in search of a suitable simile—"the bluffing of a gambler who is losing the initiative."

We saw the Afghan Army on parade. Its technical equipment is very impressive. The successful operations carried out of late in a number of provinces speak of the armed forces' enhanced combat capability. So why the alarm which can be glimpsed in the eyes of many? Is it really only based on the sentiments of dependence which have taken root, as Fakhri insisted? Here and there this is true. No matter how hard it is to admit this, a certain section of the Afghan Army was entirely satisfied with the role of an observer.

Nonetheless, the reasons for the pessimistic moods are not confined to the departure of our forces. In my view there are several reasons for them. First, doubts persist in the ability of the party to ensure the unity of its ranks and to overcome the old hostility between the two main groupings "Parcham" and "Khalq" which has in the recent past resulted in open clashes between them, which were sometimes more embittered than the clashes with the common enemy. Strife within the PDPA triggered a chain reaction in the Army, the security organs, and the militia which undermined the country's defense capability and the prestige of the party among the population

and destroyed faith in the ideals of the revolution among its supporters. The crude mistakes and repressions of the republic's former leaders have also inflicted deep wounds which are hard to heal. And finally, the demoralizing impact of the unending surprise attacks and frightening rumors spread artificially by the armed opposition must not be underestimated What is obvious to the generals, is, alas, by no means always obvious to the masses.

Any revolution is worth its salt only if it is capable of defending itself. It was in Afghanistan that I, probably for the first time, thought about that textbook quote of Lenin which is usually cited out of context in order to emphasize the need to strengthen a revolution army. However, the meaning of this expressive formulation of Lenin's is much wider and deeper. Being able to defend oneself means strengthening the unity of the party and its links with the people. That means showing the peasants, workers, and craftsmen in practice the advantages which the revolution brings them and to painstakingly help them to understand its aims and tasks. Wherever the PDPA has managed to achieve this, its positions are unshakable. [passage omitted]

Last year a power line was commissioned stretching from the border with Tajikistan to the city of Konduz. This meant that light bulbs lit up for the first time in the mud-walled houses along the whole length of the line. At the end of April the inhabitants of one of the villages learned that the mujahidin were preparing to blow up the powerline supports in their area. The local self-defense detachment consisting of 12 men decided to put up a defense. They were all killed trying to protect the light in their houses.

There are many such examples. It is as yet obviously too early to speak of a turnaround in the mood of the peasant masses, of their departure from a wait-and-see, not to mention a hostile stance. However, there have been some serious changes for the better in people's attitudes.

The ending of the aforementioned Lenin quote is usually omitted. It reads "...but a revolution does not learn to defend itself overnight." The Republic Government is currently learning this difficult art. At the price of compromises, concessions, sharing of power with representatives of other forces, the PDPA is seeking to ensure the main thing: to preserve the integrity of Afghanistan as a state, to prevent it from regressing by centuries, to ensure democratic forms of rule.

It is difficult to say what turn events will take in the neighboring country to our south. Too many internal and external factors affect their development. It is true that the opposition is still very strong. And the question of external intervention has essentially not been resolved yet. However, one thing is clear. In the intricate kaleidoscope of Afghanistan's political life one dominant trend is clearly visible. It is universal tiredness of the fratricidal conflict, a yearning for peace.

Somewhere en route for one of the villages, I asked the driver to stop the car and listened attentively to the silence. "Peace," the empty eye-sockets of the destroyed houses seemed to implore soundlessly. "Peace," begged the neglected soil, yearning for the touch of kind peasant hands. "Peace," whispered the multicolored ribbons on the stakes marking the graves of the innumerable victims of the war.

And there is no other way to peace apart from that proposed by Najibullah's government.

Afghan Rebels Suffer 'Major Failure'

PM2706144788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Rebuff Given"]

[Text] Kabul, 26 Jun—On the morning of 24 June Kowt-e 'Ashrow, the center of Vardak Province, was subjected to a concentrated attack from superior forces of the armed opposition. It took the "intransigents" just a short time to concentrate large armed formations near the city from different groupings numbering more than 2,000 fighters with heavy weaponry, including weapons brought in from other provinces. Overcoming the heroic resistance of the advance posts, the gangs managed to break into the city, which had suffered considerably from shells and other types of heavy weaponry.

The bloody battles in and around the provincial center continued for more than 24 hours. Having consequently suffered substantial losses, the extremist detachments were forced to retreat outside the city. Annoyed about the high price they had paid for the attempt, they again shelled Kowt-e 'Ashrow. New damage was done and there have been casualties among the civilian population.

The situation in the city is getting back to normal. Additional units from the Afghan Armed Forces and the Sarandoy have been brought in. The damage and losses suffered by the enemy is being calculated.

The insurgents' raid on Vardak Province is seen here as a manifestation of the new tactics being adopted by the opposition. Obviously unable to seize large cities such as Jalalabad or Qandahar—as their leaders had promised—they have decided to focus their attention on relatively small provincial centers in order to seize them for a time, regardless of losses, in an attempt to have above all a propaganda effect. After a recent crushing defeat near Qalat (the center of Zabol Province) their raid on the Kowt-e 'Ashrow area was a major failure.

U.S., Other 'Advisers' Infiltrate Afghanistan

LD2706201688 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 27 TASS—The smuggling to Afghanistan from Pakistan of advisers of all types and ranks by Western and other secret services is one of the manifestations of an open violation of the letter and spirit of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan.

According to reports reaching here, the smuggling of military instructors to the areas of deployment of the so-called "irreconcilable" opposition forces was stepped up in the past 10 days. Their main task is to inspect those forces from the point of view of their combat preparedness, to teach them to use portable anti-aircraft missile complexes brought to the bases of the insurgents and to conduct anti-government propaganda.

For example, three foreign advisers came to the area of Bara Kheyl, Khowst District. Two American and two French advisers came to Lowgar Province for watching the extremists take part in combat operations, as well as for shooting films and taking photos. On June 23 a group of Western cameramen came to Peshawar with films they had made about the 'heroic deeds' of the extremists in Vardak Province. The films are to be used in the propaganda work, while part of them will be put at the disposal of the intelligence services of the Pakistani Army under an agreement reached. The day before four American photo correspondents came to the Musaqaleh District with a special mission: They were to collect inventions about the non-existent 'atrocities' committed by the Russians. Provocative tasks of the same kind were set before numerous commissions of various Western services that come in large numbers to the Bajaur, Mohmand, Kurram and Khaibar Districts of Pakistan. They are collecting facts about alleged 'violations' by the Afghan side of provisions of the Geneva accords. The Pakistani authorities are going to use the 'evidence' collected by the commissions in official representations to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan.

Afghanistan's enemies from some Arab countries also display special activity. Their instructors teach the "irreconcilables" how to handle various types of heavy armaments and give them a general military training. Two Arab advisers are working at the Pol-e Khomri District to give consultations to the insurgents on how they should blast with fire the outposts of the government troops. In Paktia Province Chinese specialists render assistance in the construction and equipment of two more combat training centres in the area of Turkihorda Mangal [name as received], finally, two Pakistani instructors have been staying in Oruzgan Province for ten days. It is planned to further expand the smuggling to Afghanistan of foreign citizens attached to extremist units of various counterrevolutionary parties and groups.

CIA Efforts Against Afghanistan Outlined

LD2706165288 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] Berlin June 23 TASS—Covert support for the Afghan armed opposition on the part of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has become the agency's largest-scale operation since the days of the war in Vietnam. This conclusion has been drawn by Julius Mader, the author of the book "CIA Operation Hindukush" published recently by the Militaer Verlag Publishing House of the German Democratic Republic.

The CIA used the entire arsenal of its means—from mendacious propaganda to the formation of armed bands—for subversive activity against Afghanistan. In so doing it counted upon both internal counter-revolution and on interference from the outside. Seeking to thwart the process of progressive transformations taking place in the country since the triumph of the national democratic revolution, the CIA practically financed the conduct of combat operations by armed groups of extremists.

One can trace without much difficulty the mechanism of the CIA funding of the Afghan opposition. It includes both considerable payments directly from the CIA budget and "donations" that come mainly from NATO countries and some conservative Arab states, Julius Mader points out. The trafficking of narcotics is also a considerable source of funds. According to official data alone, the CIA provided the Afghan counter-revolutionaries with 1,715 million dollars for the purchase of arms in the period of 1979 to 1987. Some other sources mention a sum of 3,000 million dollars. Not only small arms but also anti-tank guns, anti-aircraft missiles, including Redeye and Stinger as well as poisonous substances were purchased on the money.

During its subversive activity against independent Afghanistan, U.S. imperialism used in practice a whole arsenal of dirty means and devices. Availing themselves of the fact that almost 80 per cent of the population of Afghanistan are illiterate, the enemies of the country use, first of all, radio broadcasts for ideological subversion. Apart from such notorious mouthpieces of cold war as Liberty and Radio Free Europe, the campaign is also involving the Radio Free Asia and since 1985—the Radio Free Afghanistan which is located near Stuttgart. The radio 'voices' have used and continue to use the entire range of means of influencing people's minds, urging them to launch a "holy war" against the "infidels".

The CIA activities assume an increasingly ominous character now that the national reconciliation policy proclaimed by the Afghan leadership is beginning to yield the first positive results and now that constructive steps are being made towards achieving peace and tranquility throughout the territory of Afghanistan. The CIA virtually acts as an inciter of armed provocations which are staged from Pakistani territory against Afghanistan, and which put in jeopardy the realisation of the accords reached during the Geneva talks.

It was pointed out at a press conference, organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan in Kabul on June 22, that there were foreign instructors, including U.S. citizens, among terrorist groups operating in a number of areas in Afghanistan.

Summing up the developments of the latest month, A.G. Javshan, head of the Foreign Ministry's Bureau for Liaison with the Mission of the U.N. Observers in Afghanistan and Pakistan, emphasised at the press conference that caravans with arms and extremist detachments continued to penetrate Afghanistan, and that CIA-funded military camps of insurgents still functioned in Pakistan's areas which border on the Republic of Afghanistan.

The Islamabad authorities, behind which there is an ominous shadow of Langley, act contrary to the will of the Afghan and Pakistani peoples. In the final analysis, the policy which is being pursued by the Pakistani authorities is directed against peace and stability not only in Afghanistan but in the entire region as well.

Afghans Pass 34th Note to UN Observer Group

LD2706191688 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 27 TASS—The Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan handed in today a 34th note to the U.N. Observer Group in Kabul, citing new violations by Pakistan of the Geneva accords and stating the precise time, place and nature of the violations. The BAKHTAR News Agency reports that the note contains a demand for a careful investigation of the facts cited and for the findings to be reported to the Afghan Government and to the personal representative of the U.N. secretary general.

'Senior Officials' Discuss Post-Summit Mideast

PM2706120388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ways of Solving the Problem Discussed"]

[Text] In Moscow on 21 June, representatives of the Soviet Union and Arab countries discussed the prospects for achieving peace in the Near East in the light of the recent Soviet-American summit meeting. Senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Ministry, academics, and Soviet and Arab journalists participated in the discussion, organized on the initiative of the UN mission in the USSR.

It was noted that the Moscow meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan laid the foundation for a new and very important stage in the search for ways of settling the conflict in the Near East. The talks held in the Moscow capital removed many questions slowing down efforts aimed at establishing a general, just, and lasting peace in the region.

The Soviet Union's creative quest for new ways to solve international problems, including those in the Near East, is being carried out on the basis of the USSR's loyalty to the principled policy of supporting the Arab peoples' just cause. Here the Soviet state is showing flexibility and realism, thanks to which its actions are yielding positive results.

The participants in the discussion noted that in the new international situation, the continuation of the uprising in the occupied Arab territories and the positive rseults of the Algiers conference of heads of Arab states and governments are a factor of great importance for restoring peace and justice in the Near East.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Quadripartite Talks on Southern Africa Held

Second Round Welcomed

PM2606121588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 88 First Edition p 1

[Igor Tarutin's "Correspondent's Comment": "Latest Meeting"]

[Text] Harare, 22 Jun—The second round of talks among South Africa, the United States, Cuba, and Angola on a peaceful settlement to the situation in southern Africa will take place in Cairo 24-25 June. The granting of independence to Namibia and normalization of the situation in and around Angola will be particularly under discussion.

The latter entails Washington and Pretoria giving up their interference in its internal affairs by supporting the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] antigovernment movement and also entails the South African military ceasing its aggressive actions against Angolan territory. The possibility of the withdrawal from Angola of the Cuban contingent, which is located there, is also being examined in the context of resolving these two questions.

The first meeting of these four countries' delegations took place at the beginning of May this year in London. Real progress failed to be achieved that time. There are many reasons for this. One of the main ones, in my view, is the unconstructive stance of South Africa, which prefers to use force and wants to impose its conditions. It is notable that on the eve of talks in the Egyptian capital South Africa mobilized its reservists, and its forces located in Namibia were moved up to the Angolan border. At the same time South African military aid to UNITA continues and is even increasing. U.S. deliveries of weapons to the gangsters is not ceasing either.

The conflict in the south of the black continent is, I think, one of the most acute on our planet, on a par with the Near East conflict. This is why it has continued for many years, and why it affects the interests of many forces and countries. The United States has, in effect, taken the talks under its auspices. Washington has sufficiently powerful means of influence on Pretoria, and

whether the United States wants it or not, its prestige is laid on the line; its ability to unravel the regional crisis is being tested. Very many people in Africa now assess the situation precisely like this. As for the Soviet Union, as has already been noted, it positively assesses the process which has begun and is ready, if need be, to join in. Moreover, the USSR proceeds from the premise that the disentangling of the situation in Angola and Namibia would be an important step on the path to a comprehensive settlement in southern Africa.

Talks Open in Cairo

LD2406021888 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Cairo June 24 TASS—Angola, Cuba, the United States and South Africa began the second round of talks on settling the situation in southern Africa here today.

The central issues of the agenda of the meeting, held behind closed doors, is the normalisation of the situation in Angola and the implementation of Resolution 435 of the U.N. Security Council on decolonising South Africa-occupied Namibia.

The first round of talks was held in London on May 3-4 this year.

The Angolan delegation to the talks is headed by Foreign Minister Afonso Van Dunem; the Cuban, by Jorge Risquen Valds, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba; and the U.S. delegation is led by Chester Crocker, assistant secretary for African affairs.

The Republic of South Africa is represented by Foreign Minister Roelof Botha and Defense Minister Magnus Malan.

Current Round Ends

PM2706134988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Egypt: Second Round of Talks Completed"]

[Text] Cairo, 26 Jun—The second round of talks between the People's Republic of Angola [PRA], Cuba, the United States, and the RSA on settling the situation in southern Africa ended in the Egyptian capital Saturday. Questions of normalizing the situation in the PRA and fulfilling UN Security Council Resolution 435 on the decolonization of Namibia were discussed during the 2-day meeting.

These quadripartite talks continued the work begun in London in May this year, the statement published on the results of the meeting states. In order to develop the progress made during them, it was decided to conduct an exchange of opinions at the level of experts in the United States in mid-July.

During a news conference held here, Afonso Van Dunem, head of the Angolan delegation and PRA foreign minister, described the results of the talks as an important advance on the way to settling the conflict in southern Africa. By advancing specific practical proposals Angola is doing everything possible for the speediest realization of the aims of the quadripartite meeting, he said. The PRA seeks the immediate implementation of Resolution 435, the cessation of the RSA's aggressive sallies against Angola, respect for its sovereignty and territorial integrity, and the abandonment of support for the bandit grouping of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola by Pretoria and Washington. Only after the threat of new aggressive actions against our country has been eliminated can the question of the withdrawal of the contingent of Cuban internationalists from the PRA be resolved, A. Van Dunem emphasized.

'Some Progress' at Talks

LD2706091788 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] Cairo June 27 TASS—Some progress has been achieved at the second round of the quadripartite talks on the settlement of the situation in the south of Africa in which the People's Republic of Angola, Cuba, the United States and South Africa are taking part. This has been stated here upon the end of the meeteing by Afonso Van Dunem, minister of foreign affairs of Angola.

Talks in the Egyptian capital were held in an atmosphere of frankness, he pointed out. During the talks the Angolan side pointed out that peace could be established in the south of Africa only on condition of the fulfilment of Resolution 435 of the U.N. Security Council on the decolonization of Namibia and the termination of outside interference in the affairs of Angola. As for the presence of Cuban internationalists in Angola, this cannot pose any threat to other countries.

"Angola and Cuba come out for the conclusion of an agreement on southern Africa which would ensure true independence for Namibia, security to Angola and peace to the whole of the region", Jorge Risquet, member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, head of the Cuban delegation at the talks, told journalists. He said that the unconditional fulfilment of all the provisions of Resolution 435, termination of any foreign assistance to gangs of the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] group and guarantees to Angola that South Africa will stop its aggressive actions against it should form the basis of the agreement.

According to Jorge Risquet, if these goals are attained, the reasons for the stay in Angola of the contingent of Cuban internationalists will be eliminated. They came there at the request of the Angolan Government and in conformity with the U.N. Charter for rendering assistance in repulsing the aggression of South Africa.

Commentary Views Results

MB2706202088 Moscow in English to South Africa 1800 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Unattributed station commentary]

[Text] We begin with a report by a Radio Moscow correspondent about the second round of talks held by Angola, South Africa, Cuba, and the United States in a bid to achieve a settlement in the south of Africa.

All the delegations were very reserved in their comments on the results of the talks, which they described as positive but moderate. However, nobody had expected quick results. Pretoria, for a long time, approached all problems in the south of Africa from the position of strength. Even now, some observers keep wondering what is really behind the South African authorities' consent to enter into dialogue—the desire to settle a dangerous regional conflict, or an attempt to gain time.

The South African authorities have, with Washington's support, claimed that the presence of Cuban volunteers in Angola is the main obstacle. Let me remind you that the Cubans help Luanda in repelling aggression from the south. Part of Angola's southern province has for several years been occupied by South African troops. Pretoria and their Washington backers have been demanding that, first, the Cuban volunteers must be withdrawn from Angola before other problems can be tackled. The have also been insisting that Luanda should recognize claims to power laid by the antigovernment group of UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], led by Jonas Savimbi, who has connections with the CIA.

The Angolan Government has said that the Cuban troops are staying in the country at its invitation, and that it never invited South African troops. But, further talks are possible. Luanda's position is based on Resolution 435 of the UN Security Council on southern Africa. That resolution provides for a cease-fire, the withdrawal of South African troops from the occupied territory, and free and democratic elections in Namibia under international control. Only in that case will there be no need for the presence of Cuban volunteers in Angola.

As we have seen, the attitudes are largely different. However, some changes were made during the talks. What these changes are hasn't been announced. It is only known that another round of talks at the experts' level will begin in the United States on 11 next month [July].

Latin America & Caribbean

Haitian Communist Comments on Namphy Coup

PM2606100588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Own special correspondent A. Kamorin dispatch under the "IZVESTIYA Calling" rubric: "Origins of the Putsch"]

[Text] Havana—Observers following events in Haiti, where a military coup has been carried out restoring General Henri Namphy's administration to power, are wondering about the causes of such a drastic change in the situation in the Haitian political arena.

Namphy himself, as is well known, has said he decided to overthrow the civilian government of Leslie Manigat because of the "threat to establish a dictatorship." For his part, the Haitian president, who has been deported to Santo Domingo, has given a quite different version. Calling Namphy "clinically insane," Manigat described his own administration as the "last possible chance for democratization" and accused the country's social forces of not supporting his "reform" and thereby creating a suitable situation for the restoration of military rule.

Your correspondent telephoned Rene Theodore, secretary general of the United Party of Haitian Communists, in Port-au-Prince and asked him to give his opinion on the situation in the country.

Kamorin: Comrade Theodore, what is the city like after the coup?

Theodore: If you discount the closed airport and constant interruptions of telephone communications with the outside world, the situation in the city is normal. Haitians have on the whole received the change of government with indifference. Leslie Manigat never enjoyed popularity in the country and was never considered the legitimate president by anyone: The ignominious spectacle of the 17 January "elections" is still too fresh in our minds. No one is pleased to see the restoration of Namphy rule, but no one is about to defend the former government.

Kamorin: What was it, nevertheless, that spurred Namphy to overthrow a government that was effectively put into power by the military themselves.

Theodore: Manigat broke the conditions of the secret compact with the generals. He tried to change the ambiguous position of his government, which had no real strength in the country. Even before the crisis connected with the attempt to transfer Colonel Jean-Claude Paul, the president had tried to carry out minor readjustments in the army (at lieutenant level), bypassing the military hierarchy. It would appear that his aim was to create a stratum of officers who owed their promotion to him personally. I can recall that similar methods were used in the country under Francois Duvalier, whose retinue included Leslie Manigat.

All this was bound to cause discontent among the military, particularly after the president began talking in a number of recent speeches about the need for "strong government." What the generals wanted was an obedient not a strong government. What is involved here are not disagreements of principle but merely the demarcation of the bounds of power.

Kamorin: How do you think events may develop?

Theodore: We are dealing with a military regime that has dissolved parliament and not set any limit to its term of office. True, Namphy has proclaimed his "commitment" to the ideals of 7 February 1986, the date on which Jean-Claude Duvalier fled the country. That may signify the restoration of certain abrogated constitutional safeguards in the future and a new attempt to impart a certain democratic facade to the state in the longer term. I think that next time the generals will approach the choice of candidates with more care.

Recent Developments in Haiti Observed
PM2706165188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Kamorin report under the rubric "Pertinent Remarks": "Echo of Coup"]

[Excerpts] Havana—According to reports coming from Port-au-Prince, life in the Haitian capital is returning to normal after the military coup by General Henri Namphy. [passage omitted]

The head of the junta has made a number of changes in the Army's officer corps, which, however, did not affect Colonel Jean-Claude Paul, commander of the capital's "Dessalines" battalion. For it was the decision to replace him which "triggered" the crisis which culminated in the coup. Attention is drawn to the fact that the young officers whom [deposed President] Manigat had tried to promote in the last weeks of his rule have been dismissed by order of Namphy. This was to have been expected: Realizing that he does not have any support from the country's political forces, the dictator wants to ensure the Army's absolute allegiance—this is the only guarantee that his power will last.

U.S. reaction to the Haitian events was a major surprise. Immediately after the coup Washington condemned it, but literally the next day the tone of its pronouncements abruptly changed. Phyllis Oakley, deputy spokesperson of the State Department, in essence repudiating her own previous pronouncements, announced virtual recognition of the Namphy junta: The United States intends to continue to maintain relations with Haiti and will not apply additional sanctions against it.

But Secretary of State G. Shultz expressed the hope that the military's advent to power will make it possible "to hand over narcotics traffickers to U.S. justice." The leader of the U.S. foreign policy department was clearly alluding to Colonel Paul, who was sentenced in absentia by a Miami court for smuggling narcotics. What will happen?

There is the truly Machiavellian scenario whereby Paul will serve Namphy's interests twice over: First as the person who created the excuse for carrying out the putsch, and then as the scapegoat.

It should be said that the United States is alone in recognizing Namphy. The number of countries, organizations, and politicians sharply condemning the coup is growing by the hour. The Argentinian and Venezuelan Governments have just issued such official statements.

Stop Press [subhead]

Former Haitian President L. Manigat, overthrown as a result of the military coup and expelled from the country, left for a trip to the United States and other West European states.

As news agencies report, the main aim of the visits is to convince the U.S. Government and other Western countries to isolate the new military government in Haiti.

Reconciliation Commission Meets in Managua
LD2306110188 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] Managua June 23 TASS—A meeting of the commission for national reconciliation in Nicaragua has been held here. The commission was set up within the framework of the implementation of the Guatemala agreements on settling the situation in Central America.

Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo, the commission's chairman, has pointed out the need for a continuation of the political dialogue between the government and contra forces. In an interview with journalists here, he voiced hope that the final ceasefire talks which had been unilaterally broken off by the contras would resume in Managua on June 26.

Meanwhile contra groups continue to practise terrorist acts against the civilian population of Nicaragua. Radio Sandino station reported that near Jinotega bandits ambushed a car, killing four people.

A Defence Ministry communique circulated here points out that contra groups have intensified actions against units of the Sandinist People's Army.

A withdrawal of contra groups towards northern borders of the republic, closer to their bases in Honduras, was observed at the same time. The bandits are driving civilian population away together with them. About 300 people were kidnapped of late in Matagalpa and Jinotega Departments alone, the communique emphasizes.

Nicaragua Minister Condemns Honduran Stand
LD2406141088 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Managua June 24 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Kurguzov reports:

Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto has accused Honduras of stymieing the process of peaceful settlement in Central America.

At a press conference here Thursday, he informed those present about the results of a conference of the Central American foreign ministers, who are members of the executive commission to monitor the Guatemalan agreements, held in Tegucigalpa.

An obstructionist stance by the Honduran representative has thwarted the signing of a joint message to U.N. Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar, which asked to incorporate into the international monitoring commission also observers from Spain, Canada and West Germany. The Honduran minister demanded that Nicaragua withdraw the lawsuit filed against Honduras in the International Court of Justice in The Hague for the backing by the Tegucigalpa authorities of the contra gangs.

D'Escoto denounced the Honduran side for conscientiously stonewalling the implementation of the Guatemalan agreements, which was at odds with the official stance of President Jose Azcona. He said that Nicaragua would not alter its decision regarding the lawsuit against Honduras since that country went ahead with all-round aid to the counter-revolutionary formations and obstructed the quest for a political settlement of the situation in Nicaragua.

Nicaraguan Government Urges Resumption of Talks

LD2606112188 Moscow TASS in English 0924 GMT 26 Jun 88

[Text] Managua June 26 TASS—Nicaragua's Defense Minister Humberto Ortega has again urged the leadership of armed counter-revolution to take a constructive stand and resume the talks on ultimate ceasefire in the country, which were broken off unilaterally by the counter-revolutionaries.

The message to the directorate of the so-called "Nicaraguan Democratic Resistance" stresses the determination of the Nicaraguan Government to continue the dialogue on a peaceful settlement in the country despite the refusal of the contras to come to Managua on June 26. Humberto Ortega pointed out the possibility of holding an intermediate, preparatory meeting between representatives of the government and the contras in Miami to discuss the question of prolonging the temporary cessation of offensive operations, whose term expires on June 30. It will be also possible to decide at the meeting questions in connection with the next round of talks on reaching peace in the country. The Nicaraguan defense minister demanded that the contra leaders release 66 Nicaraguan citizens kept by them now and whom the "Nicaraguan Democratic Resistance" committed itself to turn over in Guatemala on June 19.

Cooperation Program Signed With Nicaragua

LD2406091688 Moscow TASS in English 0632 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Managua June 24 TASS—A programme of cultural and scientific exchanges between the USSR and Nicaragua for 1988-1989 was signed at the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry Thursday.

The document provides for strengthening many-faceted cooperation in the field of science, education, public health, art, mass media, sport and tourism.

Assembly Meeting in Panama Reported

LD2306172488 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] Panama June 23 TASS—The third assembly of anti-imperialist organisations of Central America and the Caribbean basin, which closed here, expressed its solidarity with Panama.

Representatives of more than 20 countries of the region unanimously passed a declaration urging the world public to comdemn the U.S. aggressive policy towards Panama.

Speaking at the assembly's final sitting, General Manuel Antonio Noriega, commander-in-chief of Panama's National Defence Forces, emphasized that Panamanian patriots would not allow the United States to establish a regime permitting to keep U.S. military bases in the country after the year 2000 which would contradict the existing treaties.

In a bid to divert the world public attention from the real aims of the U.S. unbridled campaign against Panama, the U.S. Administration resorted to a new propaganda ploy alleging that Cuban and Libyan troops were deployed in Panama, the general said.

Noriega pointed out that Panama did not need external aid and declared its right to solve internal problems independently.

He also demanded that the fair struggle of the Panamanian people for freedom and independence be respected.

19th CPSU Conference

Reportage on Conference Opening Activities

Gorbachev, Others Register

LD2706171988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Delegates have continued to register today. The mandate of delegates to the 19th all-union party conference has been handed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] I should check it, though. [video shows shots of Gorbachev entering the registration hall, sitting at a desk, and leafing through a small red book; Gorbachev is then seen filling in a form, taking it to the registration commission, and shaking hands with its members] [Word indistinct] ninth. Is it for you?

[Unidentified speaker] Yes.

[Gorbachev] Hello. I should shake hands with you so that you treat me better. [video shows Gorbachev receiving the red book back] Thank you. And this remains with you? [video shows shot of Gorbachev pointing at the form] All right. [end recording]

The mandates of delegates have been handed also to members and candidate members of the Politburo and to secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee. [video shows Dobrynin, Ryzhkov, Gromyko, Biryukova, Ligachev, Zaykov, Solomentsev, Vorotnikov, Slyunkov, Shcherbitskiy, Shevardnadze, Medvedev, Talyzin, (?Chebrikov), Demichev, Nikonov and (?Solovyev) sitting at a desk and filling in forms]

Yakovlev To Hold News Conference

LD2806085188 Moscow TASS in English 0840 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—An unusually calm atmosphere is reigning at the press centre for the 19th party conference as journalists gathered around television monitors to hear Mikhail Gorbachev's report.

The conference began today in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses at 10 a.m. sharp.

Long before the start of the conference, hundreds of Soviet and foreign journalists arrived at the press centre. Overall, more than a thousand mass media representatives from nearly 80 countries have received accreditation cards.

In the conference hall of the press centre, the speech by the Soviet leader shown live by Soviet television is being projected to a large screen.

The summary of Gorbachev's remarks in seven languages is transmitted to press centre teleprinters by TASS.

It is expected that a news conference on the results of the first day of the conference will be held here at about 6.30 p.m. Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will take part.

The great interest in the work of the Soviet Communist Party conference is due to the implementation of profound political, social and economic changes in Soviet society.

The 19th party conference is called upon to analyse the results of the first three years of the perestroyka, or restructuring, policy and give a fresh impetus to processes of democratisation, greater openness and economic reform.

TASS Describes Opening

LD2806070688 Moscow TASS in English 1054 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—A TASS correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU began its work here today. About five thousand delegates who have arrived here from all republics, regions and districts of the country have gathered in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—the city's most spacious conference hall which had been built expressly for these purposes twenty-five years ago.

The conference has been attracting paramount attention in both the party, Soviet society, and abroad since January last year when the idea of convening it was conceived. And this is only understandable: On the agenda of the conference are issues which are uppermost in all people's minds—the first results of perestroyka, and ways for further democratisation within the party and society. The unusualness of the conference is in the fact that the previous, 18th, conference of the party was held 47 years ago, at the beginning of 1941, and no conferences of the CPSU have been held since then.

Everyone of the delegates who now filled the Conference Hall of the Palace of Congresses represents about four thousand Communists. All the delegates were elected democratically: Their candidacies were nominated and preliminarily discussed as a rule in primary organisations of the party. Therefore the composition of delegates is not quite usual for such a party forum. On the Moscow delegation, for example, the representation of artistic intelligentsia is almost twice as large as that at the CPSU's 27th Congress which was held at the beginning of 1986.

The interest being shown by Soviet people in the 19th Conference of the CPSU is exceptionally great. Tens and hundreds of thousands of Communists and non-party people have expressed their opinions during the countrywide discussion of the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the conference. The Theses were issued in the spring of this year. Newspapers and magazines carried hundreds and thousands of articles during the discussion.

Taking the interest in the conference into account, Soviet television and radio are broadcasting live from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Gorbachev Opening Remarks

LD2806104988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0555 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Opening speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—live]

[Text] Comrade delegates, 5,000 delegates have been elected to our 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. Four thousand nine hundred and ninety-one delegates have arrived at the conference. The remainder are absent for good reasons—because of illness. There are grounds for the work of our conference to begin. On the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee, the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference is declared open. [applause]

We have to elect a Presidium, a Secretariat, and drafting and credentials commissions. Yesterday there was a session of the delegations' Council of Representatives. Proposals on the composition of those bodies were worked out and submitted for your examination. I hope that all delegates have a a written copy of the proposals that were worked out yesterday. I therefore think that there are grounds for starting discussions on these specific proposals. To begin with, those on the Presidium of the conference.

Perhaps I should just begin with what we had in mind in view of the nature of our conference, which bears a great responsibility. We have a lot to accomplish, much that is beneficial, and we have a great deal of work to do. There should be a more businesslike attitude at this conference. We also propose that the Presidium should be half the size of that at the congress—112 people. Are there any comments on the numbers? Can we vote on it? Good, get your temporary identification cards ready. I ask those of you in favor of electing a conference Presidium in that composition and those numbers to raise your temporary identification cards. You can put them down now. Is anyone against it? Is anyone abstaining? No. Regarding personal composition, what comments would the comrades like to make? I think that both delegations' heads have briefed you and that you have in front of you a list of those making up the Presidium.

Well, it's not so easy electing 112 individuals out of nearly 5,000. That's the number you have to consider. Any comments, comrades? No? Right. Well, I think that demonstrates mutual understanding. In that case let's put it to the vote. Those in favor of accepting the proposed composition of the conference Presidium are asked to raise their temporary cards. And lower them. Against? None. Abstentions? None. The Presidium has been unanimously elected and I request those comrades elected to the membership of the Presidium to come forward, please. [applause]

I think we can continue our work. Comrades, you—those who have read closely, paid attention to and, evidently, the delegation leaders will have told you—know that in our Presidium are all the secretaries of the republican party organizations except that of Estonia, inasmuch as Comrade Vyalyas was elected secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee after the delegates to the conference had been elected. We conferred yesterday and we are submitting the following proposal for your consideration: We do have the right to give Comrade Vyalyas a mandate so that all party organizations may be represented here. [applause] Does anyone want to raise this, comrades? You and I do have this right; generally, we have wide-ranging rights. So, those in favor of giving Comrade Vayno Iosifovich Vyalyas a mandate as a conference delegate, are asked to raise their cards and to lower them. Those against. Abstentions. None. Comrade Vyalyas, please. Invite him to the Presidium. [applause] Let me sort that out while I am at it. Please.

Ligachev Address at Opening

LD2806105588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0607 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Speech by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at the opening of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—live]

[Text] Comrades, let us begin forming the membership of the Secretariat and the drafting and credentials committees of our party conference. Let us first of all move on to the election of the Secretariat of the conference. The Council of Representatives of the delegations recommends electing a Secretariat of 27 members.

Do the comrades have any comments on the numerical and personal composition of the Secretariat of our conference? No, comrades. Then let us vote.

How will we vote, comrades? By list, or in person? In the same way as the Presidium, by list.

Let us vote, comrades: I ask those in favor of electing the proposed persons to the Secretariat to raise their temporary credentials. Please lower them, comrades. Who is against? None. Who has abstained? None. Thus the proposed membership of the Secretariat is elected unanimously.

We move on to the election of the Drafting Commission of our conference. The Council of Representatives of the delegations proposes electing a Drafting Commission, also of 27 members. Are there any other comments or suggestions, comrades, regarding the numerical and personal composition of the Editorial Commission? If not, then let us also put this to the vote.

Would those in favor of electing the membership of the Drafting Commission recommended by the Council of Representatives of the delegations please raise their credentials. Please lower them, comrades. Against? None. Abstentions? None. Thus the Drafting Commission of our conference is also elected unanimously.

The next question is the election of the Credentials Commission of the conference. The Council of Representatives of the delegations submits the proposal that a Credentials Commission of 43 members be elected. In this connection I would like to ask whether there are any other comments or proposals either on the numerical or the personal composition of the Credentials Commission of our conference. If not, comrades, then allow me to put this question to the vote also.

Would those in favor of electing the proposed membership of the Mandate Commission raise their credentials. Lower them please. Against? None. Abstentions? None. Thus the Credentials Commission is elected unanimously with the proposed membership.

We must now consider the proceedings and the time limit of the work of our conference. As you are aware, the procedure of the conference was approved last year at the June plenum of the party Central Committee. Yesterday as Mikhail Sergeyevich has noted, a session of the Council of Representatives of the delegations was held and that procedure was examined and approved. You have it in your hands. I want to remind you that the questions which are being submitted to the conference for examination are the following:

Progress in carrying out the decisions of the 27th party conference; the main results of the first half of the 12th 5-year plan; and the tasks of the party organizations in deepening the process of restructuring.

And the second question: Measures for the further democratization of the life of the party and of society. I would like to remark that the Central Committee of the party considers it desirable that a single report be delivered at this conference on both the first and second points of the agenda. Has anyone any other thoughts, comrades? I don't think we need to vote.

As far as the procedure and time limit of the conference are concerned, these proposals have been distributed to you. Are there any comments on the procedure and time limit of the work of our party conference? As I see there are no other proposals, allow me to put the question to the vote.

Would those in favor of passing the proposed procedure and time limit for the conference raise their credentials. Lower them please, comrades. Those against? None. Abstentions? None. Thus both the procedure and the time limit of our conference are also approved unanimously.

May we begin examining the matters on the agenda of the conference. For a report by the Central Committee to the 19th all-union party conference, the floor is given to Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of our party.

Leadership Lineup Noted

LD2806073688 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0618 GMT on 28 June in a live relay from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses shows the following leaders on the podium of the CPSU 19th All-Union Conference:

Central portion of front row left to right: Nikonov, Shcherbitskiy, Chebrikov, empty seat, Zaykov, Ligachev, Gorbachev, Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shevardnadze, Vorotnikov, Yakovlev, and Slyunkov.

Lineup in central portion of second row left to right: Murakhovskiy, Maslyukov, Talyzin, Yazov, Solovyev, Dolgikh, Razumovskiy, Demichev, Baklanov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Lukyanov, Medvedev, Kapitonov, unidentified male, Kolbin, and Patiashvili.

There are only three rows on the platform. Others identifiable on it include Pukhova and Academician Marchuk (front row), and Mironenko and General Lizichev (second row).

Paper Frontpages Lenin Prior to Conference

PM2706155188 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 28 June 1988 in its First Edition frontpages across four columns a 9-inch by 8-inch photograph of a smiling Lenin in his famous peaked cap, captioned "Vladimir Ilich Lenin, 1920." The photograph is carried in the middle of the page under the masthead and below an unattributed slogan or greeting in three quarter-inch boldface letters reading "Fruitful Work to You, Comrade Delegates!"

An editorial entitled "Restructuring Is Irreversible—This Is the Opinion of Soviet People" is carried next to the photograph.

Conference Must Move Country 'Only Forward'

PM2706182588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 88 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Restructuring Is Irreversible: This Is the Opinion of the Soviet People"]

[Text] The 19th all-union party conference begins its work today. It is not easy to name or to recall another event which has excited social thinking to the same extent, an event with which so many expectations, aspirations, and hopes have been linked. Soviet people perceive the conference as a major all-party consultation whose purpose is to check the strategy and tactics of restructuring at its most important and crucial stage, to "loosen" all the bottlenecks that act as brakes along its way, to give a new and mighty boost and a second breath to the revolutionary process which was launched in April 1985, and to render this process irreversible.

The country has been marching along the path of renewal for just over 3 years. Only 2 years and 4 months have passed since the 27th CPSU Congress, which turned the course of restructuring and acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development into the party's program and general line. The end of this month will draw a line under the first half of the 12th 5-Year Plan period.... To put it briefly, a solid segment of time devoted to changes is already behind us. Restructuring already has its own history; it has its initial gains and sources of experience.

"The party is to be found where the majority of workers have rallied around party decisions which give targeted, systematic, and precise answers to the most important questions." Today these lines by Lenin sound like instructions to the delegates, who are called upon to answer with utmost clarity, precision, and completeness the main questions which perturb everyone: What specifically must be done to ensure that people taste as soon as possible the fruits of restructuring, democracy, and glasnost, and to resolve the practical tasks linked with concern for man along all of life's avenues?

We know: There are no simple answers to many of the questions. But we have been given no time to limber up. Why is it, for example, that the proper correspondence of words and deeds has still not been achieved everywhere? Why is it that the radical economic reform, approved by the party and the supreme power in the country and backed by the Law on the State Enterprise, is often reduced to nothing by the departmental ambitions of conservatives? Why are administrative edict and pressure methods still applied in the countryside, as in the past? What makes local authorities in some regions trip up the cooperative system that is only just getting to its feet?

How many such questions are there! And the conference will have to "draw the line" under many of them. As a matter of fact, today sees only the official opening of the 19th party conference. In reality, this all-party and even, judging by the mailbag, all-people's forum of political thinking has been going on for a long time now—one could say since the moment when it was decided to convene it. The debate developed with particular urgency and acuteness during the campaign to elect conference delegates and reached its peak following publication of the CPSU Central Committee Theses. A platform for this debate was provided by the open meetings of Communists and the party committee plenums, the pages of central and local newspapers, the radio and television....

The PRAVDA editorial office alone has received many thousands of letters in recent days with instructions from Communists and nonparty people containing various proposals for the conference. Many of the letters begin with the phrase: "If I had the floor..." The contributions published in today's edition of PRAVDA under a rubric with that wording provide only a very incomplete picture of the wealth and scope of the polyphony of opinions, unorthodox ideas, and plans which have accompanied the preparations for the conference and contributed to and nurtured the ideological-theoretical and socioeconomic propositions of the Central Committee Theses. In the atmosphere of democratization a wave of mass political activity has literally swamped the country. We were all able to see for ourselves what mighty forces of human energy and people's spirit and intellect were languishing "untapped" under the leveling press of the impersonally dull stereotypes of the times of stagnation.

In short, the party conference has at its disposal a wealth of material for analysis, interpretation, and elaboration of effective decisions.

"Comrade delegates," L. Kravtsova writes from Volgograd, "you have the tremendous trust of the party and the people, but do not forget that your responsibility is just as great. Responsibility to the times and to the country, and responsibility for the future of our children. Do not cede an inch to the braking forces, to all sorts of people who mourn for old times. Do not make do with half-measures; otherwise, routine and old habits will make us all slide back into the old mire. This means forward, only forward, since there is no other way..."

And so, only forward! Sensible circumspection does not detract from courage in resolving vital problems; it only strengthens it. A great deal, a very great deal, depends on the decisions which will be adopted at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. This includes the effectiveness of the radical economic reform, the further democratization of all spheres of life, glasnost and openness in all the institutions of our social life, and a sharp delimitation between their functions. It includes, as well, the life-giving spirit of Soviet patriotism and the cohesion of the country's fraternal peoples, which is based on profound mutual respect and resolutely rejects any feeble impulses of the blind nationalism which corrupts and poisons people's minds and hearts.

A great deal will depend on the decisions of the 19th party conference. A great deal, but not everything. The true irreversibility of the cause of restructuring can be assured only by the combined will of the party and the people and the unbending determination of every Soviet citizen to implement the outlined plans. May the the 19th all-union party conference and its upcoming decisions become the focus of this will and turn it into a mighty creative force. Much success in your work, comrade delegates!

Latsis Discusses Party, Economic Reform

LD2706214988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Passages within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] A meeting between journalists and Otto Rudolfovich Latsis, doctor of economics and publicist, took place at the press center of the 19th party conference today. Here is a report by our correspondent Vladimir Nazarov:

[Nazarov] Although this news conference was scheduled at an early hour, the hall was absolutely packed. That's understandable, for questions were being answered by a man to whose opinion a great deal of attention is now being paid, a man whom readers respect. And this respect, as they say, has not come out of nothing. Otto Rodolfovich Latsis expresses exclusively his own opinion without adapting himself, so to speak, to the official point of view. What's more, he speaks about subjects with which he is very familiar. His arguments are therefore understandable to readers. People buy journals and newspapers especially for articles by this publicist. His articles are retold and reprinted. Following their publication journals, newspapers, radio and television receive an enormous mailbag. We decided, therefore, to present a detailed account of what was said by Otto Rudolfovich Latsis. The first question dealt with the establishment of a multiparty system in our country. On the whole, without denying this idea in principle, Otto Rudolfovich answered as follows:

[Latsis] "[Word indistinct] it would no doubt be sensible to start by bringing order into the party that is the political vanguard of society. How should this be done? Well, I think that a (?lot) of proposals on this have now been put forward during discussion [words indistinct]. In my view the main issue is the delineation of the functions of the party and the functions of the state.

"[Words indistinct] in order to carry out the functions that should be carried out by the state apparatus, and this, of course, lowers the effectiveness of work and hampers the struggle against bureaucratism. The party cannot take up a critical attitude toward state decisions because it participates in them itself alongside the state apparatus. This delineation is a most important issue. Then, of course, there is the strengthening and raising of the role of the elected bodies vis-a-vis the apparatus [words indistinct] both in the party and in the soviets to an equal degree."

[Nazarov] The majority of us work at enterprises belonging to one or another ministry and I think it will be interesting to hear an opinion regarding the prospects for the development of these industry headquarters, as we say today.

[Latsis] "My opinion is that the majority of industry ministries are unnecessary. Centralism is needed, but it must be organized by enterprises in the main. I understand the ideas of the government on this question. I think that it, too, has a criticial attitude toward the activity of ministries; it has expressed this more than once. But today (?there's no blunt instrument), it's now the transitional period when the economic levers have not yet started to operate. The economic reform is only beginning. If (?we lift) administrative control, one cannot be sure that enterprises will always operate in the interests of society. Some kind of administrative control is necessary, but one that is not exactly the same as that which is implemented by the ministries."

[Nazarov] More than once during the news conference the following question was asked: How do you view the proposal for giving Estonia economic independence? As is known, several delegates at the party conference from that republic intend to put forward such a proposal. Here is the opinion of Otto Rudolfovich Latsis in this connection:

[Latsis] "For a long time the task has been there of raising the economic sovereignty of the local soviet and raising the role of the territorial directorate. The Estonians have proposed that this should be given concrete form, the idea of the so-called financial autonomy of the republic, which would make it possible to (?account) precisely what the republic receives in its economic links from the other republics and what it gives to the other republics.

"In my opinion this is a good idea; once again, not only as applied to the republics, but also to oblasts and krays. A precise calculation is needed. It is likewise a good idea for departments not to command the economy absolutely without consulting with the soviets. But I think that there is not enough of a mechanism to ensure the implementation of this idea immediately."

[Nazarov] A correspondent of the Indian newspaper PATRIOT asked Otto Rudolfovich to explain what in his view market socialism is. Before switching on the recording of his answer, I would like to stress that as yet, there has been no interpretation given to this concept of market socialism anywhere in literature, be it economic, publicistic, or philosophical. So the response by Latsis, doctor of economic sciences, does not begin in the way in which I assume the Indian journalist expected.

[Latsis] "[Words indistinct] is based on the full financial autonomy of enterprises. There should be a consumer market. The market should determine demands and influence the principal areas of the development of production. In particular, I think that there is simply no other way than market pressure, in the search for stimuli for the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, the renovation of production, and the [word indistinct] of output. The market should determine demand, the quantity and quality of products, assortment, and price, to a significant degree.

"But market socialism, if it is interpreted in such a way that social and human values are pushed into the background, the individual is completely sacrificed to productivity, and unemployment is recognized, then I think that we do not need this [words indistinct]."

[Nazarov] Lately, Otto Rudolfovich Latsis has frequently written articles about Stalin's personality cult, about his [words indistinct]. As I suspected, journalists did not avoid this topic today. The question was divided into two parts. First, he was asked to give a picture of Stalin as an economist, and second, he was asked about the present political portrait of the Soviet people.

[Latsis] "As an economist, he was, for all that, rather distant from Marxism and from Leninism, and I believe his economic policy after the war to be especially catastrophic. We already had a major industry. It was created at the expense of what was virtually a loan, an enormous economic and social loan from the countryside, at the expense of the bleeding of the countryside. Then the war dealt a terrible blow to the countryside and agriculture, both economic and in purely human terms. Simply put, every man left the countryside for the war and very few returned.

"There was both the opportunity and the need for the workforce of the countryside to be replenished; indeed, this was one of the central tasks after the war. But Stalin repeated the tasks—in 1946 in his renowned speech during a pre-election meeting—he repeated the tasks of industrialization and the countryside was so decimated that in central Russia it was simply gone. The restoration of production had already become not simply an economic or technical question, but a social question. Quite simply it was necessary to restore the population.

"As to the Soviet people's political level today, the most important thing to be mentioned is that the Soviet people do not accept any cult today. When they sometimes talk about Khrushchev's or Brezhnev's cults, I disagree with this. There have not been any cults like these. There have been attempts to praise the people [words indistinct] praise Stalin. The main shortcoming, although not [word indistinct] in the general political portrait of the people is that it has a very strong notion of socialism being a system that is giving, giving, and giving something [word indistinct] and they have to just open their mouths and chew it. In other words, there is an exaggeration of protecting and distributing functions of socialism, and an underestimation of producing functions. Lenin, however, believed that labor productivity was the first thing to determine success for socialism."

[Nazarov] And, of course, everyone was interested in whether Otto Rudolfovich will be speaking at the party conference. If he does, what is the system now regarding preparing texts of speeches to be made at the party conference?

[Latsis] "[Words indistinct] I do not know whether I will be given an opportunity but I have not received any instructions on what and how I must speak. No one has asked for a text of my speech. Everyone is preparing the way he thinks appropriate."

[Nazarov] In conclusion I want to say that another major news conference that lasted many hours was held today. It subject was democratization and glasnost as the most important conditions for raising the Soviet people's level of activity.

More on Latsis, Afanasyev Remarks

PM2806120088 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 88 p 1

[Special correspondents R. Guseynov and A. Drozdov report from the international press center of the 19th all-union party conference: "Guarantees of Democracy"]

[Text] On Sunday morning the journalists' guest was M.P. Vyshinskiy, USSR deputy minister of justice. Naturally, a large proportion of the questions concerned constitutional and legal guarantees for Soviet citizens and changes in our legislation.

Answering an important question on what must be done in legal and judicial terms to make the restructuring processes irreversible, one of the leaders of our justice pointed to the leading role that the law is called upon to play in this important matter.

A large group of entirely new laws are to be adopted in the USSR. It is important to make the laws the main form of legal regulation. As yet the picture in this respect is frankly not impressive. Suffice it to say that from 1936, after the ratification of the third USSR Constitution, through 1985 only some 200 laws were adopted. And 60-65 percent of them were ratifications of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees. A weighty package of new laws are now being discussed: on socialist ownership, on the fundamentals of management of the socialist economy, on the planning of the USSR'S economic and social life, and on output quality.

When we speak of the methods of legal regulation of social reconstruction and guarantees of restructuring, we can speak boldly of a truly revolutionary breakthrough in this sphere, M.P. Vyshinskiy stressed. A sphere which, I may add, has until recently been highly conservative.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA asked a question about the need to draft a law on young people and the proposed schedule for work on this document.

M.P. Vyshinskiy pointed out that the need to adopt such a law is indisputable. The problem is what kind of document it should be. The practice of states where such a law exists indicates that it often amounts to a collection of slogans and wishes. We would like to create a different kind of document, a document capable of regulating the position of young people in society and their rights and duties.

A correspondent for REUTER, the major world agency, asked: Will those who were subjected to criminal proceedings for anti-Soviet activity in past years be rehabilitated?

"I would put the question more broadly," M.P. Vyshinskiy said. "As far as I know, at present no one is serving a sentence under the relevant Articles 70 and 90 of the Criminal Code. It is a question of something else: a radical revision of legislation in this area. A whole series of actions will be placed outside the bounds of the Criminal Code and become classified as administrative violations. There will be a humanization of punishment measures. In particular, the possibility of the use of the death penalty will be severely curtailed. The debate on abolishing it entirely continues."

The Voice of America is, of course, interested in the role of KGB organs. Are changes planned in the relationship between these organs, the courts, and the prosecution service?

The answer was this: The KGB operates within the framework of the law. Its powers are governed by Soviet legislation, including the Criminal Code. The USSR Prosecutor's Office exercises firm supervision over the KGB's activity, and that must remain. Any case investigated by the KGB comes to court in any event, and that rule is strictly observed. If there are any changes in these laws, they will apply to the KGB too; there will be no exceptions here.

There was a tense, dynamic pace to life at the press center on Monday morning as well. One of the most popular Soviet journalists, Doctor of Economic Sciences O. Latsis, deputy chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST and a conference delegate, answered journalists' questions in a polemical, trenchant form.

Many were interested in the programs recently proposed in the Baltic region, in particular the idea of an economically accountable republic, which originated in Estonia.

"That has long been under debate," O. Latsis noted. "In my view, it is an interesting idea. It originated as a position in the struggle against the unlimited power of departments. I think not only one republic, but other krays, oblasts, and republics could be economically accountable.

"However, a number of questions arise, without whose resolution success can hardly be counted on. We have no economically justified system of payment for land, water, manpower. That is how it comes about that the calculations made in Tartu and in Moscow differ drastically. The USSR Academy of Sciences is currently working on a study of this question. I think it will be possible to say 'yes' to this idea in the near future."

Will L. Trotskiy be rehabilitated in the future?

There is such a thing as civil rehabilitation, and L. Trotskiy deserves it. He was not a spy or a murderer and committed no crimes. But there is also political rehabilitation, restoration within the party. That, in my view, will not happen. And this is why. L. Trotskiy was expelled from the party not in 1937, but 10 years earlier. The truth is that it is necessary to stop keeping quiet about his role and place in the organization of our Army and participation in party building. But it must not be forgotten that he came out repeatedly against Lenin and against the general party line. An objective clarification of his role in our history will not lead to the political rehabilitation of L. Trotskiy.

But regardless of this, his works should be available. This, too, is part of our history.

A correspondent for the American newspaper BALTIMORE SUN asked: Who chooses the speakers at the conference, who is making the preparations?

The CPSU Central Committee is making the preparations for the conference, and that is only natural. Many people want to speak, I can say that with confidence. But who will speak—that is hard to say. For instance, L. Zaykov said at a meeting with delegates from Moscow that as a member of the Politburo and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom he has expressed his position at the meetings with Muscovites that preceded the conference, and therefore does not intend to speak at the conference.

"As for me," O. Latsis noted, "I am prepared to speak. If they give me the floor, I will speak. I have received no instructions about my speech. And nobody has inspected my text."

The journalists also showed great interest in the next news conference, conducted by Yu. Sklyarov, leader of the press center. Taking part were delegates to the 19th party conference: V. Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA; N. Bikkenin, chief editor of the journal

KOMMUNIST; M. Ulyanov, chairman of the RSFSR Union of Theater Workers; and V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers' Union Board.

Does what V. Korotich and Yu. Afanasyev are saying and writing today fit into the framework of socialism? Will PRAVDA print the full text of their speeches if they speak? That question was put to V. Afanasyev.

"The two delegates mentioned operate within the framework of socialism," V. Afanasyev replied. "I personally do not agree with everything they say. But it is something else that seems important to me: PRAVDA seeks to make its pages widely available to the most diverse authors with different viewpoints.

"But what worries me in the work of certain press organs is the endless criticism, the lack of a positive program. You cannot go far on criticism alone, you need leading experience of restructuring too.

"Now to a note I have received. Here I am asked about differences within the Soviet leadership. I must state quite specifically that there are no political contraditions within the Soviet leadership," V. Afanasyev noted. "I have taken part in the work of the Politburo and Secretariat in the Brezhnev years and today. The difference is tangible. Formerly, everything was simple enough. You had the finished draft, you discussed it a bit, you voted, and you went your separate ways. Now some sessions cannot be completed in a day, they are continued the next day. Thus the question of Chernobyl was discussed for 1 and ½ days.

"Lengthy debates and heated disputes also arise about the time scale, methods, and forms of restructuring. But everyone agrees on one thing: Restructuring is vitally necessary to our society."

News Conference on Glasnost

LD2706215188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Report by special correspondent (Marina Novitskaya) from the press center of the 19th all-union party conference]

[Text] [(Novitskaya)] Today, on the eve of the opening of the 19th all-union party conference, the working day of the press center was particularly busy. One meeting had not finished before another started, and it too was very interesting. Journalists had the chance to put questions to many delegates to the party conference. They included. for example, Latsis, the well-known economist, and (Vorobyev), first secretary of a raykom in Pskov Oblast. The participants in the recent joint Soviet-Bulgarian space flight paid a visit to the press center. Comrade Sklyarov, head of the press center and head of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, told the journalists about how the work of the party conference would be publicized. Now I shall tell you in more detail about the news conference, the theme of which was defined as: Democracy and Glasnost, the Most Important Conditions for the Development of the Social Activity of the Workers.

I hardly need to stress how broad this theme is, and how many different aspects there are to it. Well, of course, there was a lot of interest shown in it. Those taking part in the press conference had to answer questions for nearly 2 hours. Now you can hear extracts from it. One of the first questions was on the critical tendency of publications in the press. This is what Viktor Grigoriyevich Afanasyev, editor in chief of PRAVDA, had to say about it:

[Begin Afanasyev recording] We cannot manage without criticism. Criticism is useful, criticism is essential, like the air. But you won't get far on criticism alone. Constructive decisions are needed. Problems must be solved; it is necessary to look for ways and means to solve problems. And we at PRAVDA try to do exactly this: To give materials which, along with their criticism, give some sort of positive solutions. We try to find experience of restructuring, frontranking experience of restructuring. We try to support it. I don't want to cite a lot of names, but let's say (Traktin), (Nikolay Traktin), the famous builder—it was PRAVDA which supported him. Or (Chabanov), the Ukrainian engineer. He is an interesting engineer, the director of a works now: He too was excluded from the party, and we supported him. Now he is the director of an association which produces first rate machine tools. [end recording]

[(Novitskaya)] And another question: The place and role of literature in relations between nationalities. It was naturally put to Vladimir Vasiliyevich Karpov, first secretary of the Board of the USSR Union of Writers:

[Begin Karpov recording] National questions come up very, very frequently today, and in many areas of our country they have even become more serious. The Union of Writers was one of the first, not only to notice this, but to take its own steps. We held a plenum of the USSR Union of Writers on this very theme: National relations and the improvement of the creative work of our writers. It was a very heated plenum. The documents from it were published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and—as is generally the case under glasnost—very many critical remarks were made on the subject you spoke of. Indeed, you are right: Those festivals, and tours by large groups from republic to republic, or visits here to Moscow, were often accompanied by loud beating of drums. Of course it was not good that it should be for the trappings, for the show, just so as to come and have a little talk. The new leadership of the Union of Writers, which I represent, we have decided, on the advice of the delegates to the congress, not to have such showy activities.

But voices are being raised more and more often, now, at our plena, and in our secretariat: We are criticized, and quite correctly, for having, as they say, thrown out the baby with the bathwater. They say that these festivals are necessary, and exchanges of visits; well, it is absolutely essential at this time to speak, and even more to discuss,

in a businesslike and real way. We are holding them again, but now with a different content. And this is helping in clarifying the literature which is somehow hindering us from getting closer together and improving our fraternal relations. [end recording]

[(Novitskaya)] Many journalists touched on the theme of the leading role of the Communist Party. Here is the opinion of Naily [as heard] Borisovich Bikkenin [chief editor of KOMMUNIST]:

[Begin Bikkenin recording] Of course, for us this is one of the central questions. It will be implemented in different way. This means giving up the administrative command methods of the work of party organs. It means a strict monitoring of the work of the party apparatus by the elected organs, for it has happened here that the apparatus dictated its will to the elected organs. The third thing is the strict limitation of its economic and political functions. To put it in another way, we are returning to the Leninist methods of leadership, and I am not afraid of appearing a dogmatist in your eyes, if I quote from memory something Lenin said. He taught Communists that it is necessary, he said, to be able to lead not by the strength of power—meaning administrative power—but by the strength of greater talent, greater knowledge, greater experience and greater versatility. And the last thing: This leadership will pass through Communists working in different organizations. And there is another question, probably the hardest one for me: What is your evaluation of the situation in ideological work? I think the most important thing for us now in ideological work is first to comprehend the theoretical arsenal of restructuring, and to read a lot of Lenin in a new way.

I will illustrate this idea with just one example. Let's say part of the Leninist understanding and the Leninist vision of socialism has been boiled down to three things: industrialization, collectivization, and the cultural revolution. In any case, at university that's what I was taught. At the same time important elements were lost: The New Economic Policy was explained only very briefly; the idea of self-management for some reason started to be regarded as revisionist—that's to say, it was reconsidered at the 18th party conference. Then the Leninist idea of workers' control was lost; the Leninist idea of a Central Control Commission got lost—that's to say, the self-regulating mechanisms which would have allowed the party to purify itself and work at a normal rate. I could cite a number of other examples of Leninist ideas which got lost. They must not be dogmatically reproduced of course, but we must be able to put them into the context of the time.

Second, I think that there has been a break away from the individual in ideological work, in other words, there have been a great many slogans, much idle talk and empty talk, and so on and so forth. And just remember what slogans the Bolsheviks had—clear, precise, and expressive. Let me quote just two: The Fatherland Is In Danger! All for the Front, All for the Victory! These are addressed to the feelings and thoughts of the individual. In other words, the propaganda of ideology should be addressed directly to the individual. Very often we used to meet people, as we sat at green tables in fine offices. But we must know how to speak on the streets and at meetings, to be able to polemicize and so on. In other words, it must be convincing propaganda. [end recording]

[(Novitskaya)] Foreign journalists are carefully watching our press and have noticed pronouncements on the fate of creative unions. For example, this question was asked: Can a creative union be dissolved? What does Mikhail Ulyanov, chairman of the Board of the Union of Theatrical Artists of Russia, think about this? Let's listen:

[Begin Ulyanov recording] It is stated in the Regulations of the Union of Theatrical Artists that the Union, should it not fulfill its obligations, is dissolved by a joint decision with a congress of theatrical artists. Constitutionally, as it were legally, we can dissolve the union if it does not meet the demands of the time. But, generally speaking, this is unrealistic for the simple reason that we are now engaged in reducing our endless organizations which are already beyond our powers. And it is also being suggested to us that we set up not one union of theatrical artists, but two unions of theatrical artists, three unions of theatrical artists, and so on. In this case, nothing will come of our fight against bureaucracy. The matter is very simple: Within the union we want to create—within any union of artists—we want to create the opportunity for pluralism—I can't say it straight out, we're still learning—which would make it possible for different points of view to be expressed. It isn't necessary to set up one's own union to do this. You are right that in the twenties the diversity of arts, artists and theaters was quite remarkable. A great abundance of all kinds of studios, trends and movements. And then in the thirties all this was, so to speak, broken off, by a tough hand. But now we are establishing such an atmosphere within our unions. [end recording]

[(Novitskaya)] There was also this question:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] Viktor Grigoryevich, recently, I mean during the last year or, perhaps, 2 years, we have observed in the press a very sharp and keen criticism of the past in the press, fiction and in journals; do you think that this is a slightly one-sided evaluation, and that instead of blank spots [belyye pyatna] one single black spot [chornoye pyatno] of the past is being created? Is this not also unjust; this is also, to a certain extent, a half-truth. What is your view?

[Afanasyev] Indeed, I have already spoken about this in part. Great attention is being paid in our newspapers and journals to criticism of the past, criticism of so-called Stalinism. Certain people have even reached the stage where they are trying to cross out our entire history as a whole, perhaps excluding the NEP. I am against such a one-sided stand. I have already spoken about this more than once, both on television and in the press. History

must be written as it is, basing oneself not on any old fabrications and inventions such as someone said something. History should be made on the basis of documents, on the basis of facts and on the basis of scientific generalizations. For instance, in PRAVDA over the last few months, we have had pages of history with the Institute of Marxism and Leninism and these pages have been editied by Academician Smirnov, director of the institute. Of course much still has to be done here. For example, the archives should be opened, certain documents should be declassified. This is already being done gradually. Few people know that at one time PRAVDA published its own journal. It was called PROZHEKTOR. It was published I think from 1924 to 1930 something. The journal was closed down because its chief editor was Nikolay Ivanovich Bukharin. Now this journal is open. We are engaged in reprinting some of it. It contains much that is interesting. That is, what I am trying to say? The account of the past cannot be one-sided, and we, in PRAVDA in particular, write against this from time to time. Not everyone likes it, but what can you do? [end recording]

[(Novitskaya)] Many people are getting the impression that the social activity of the intelligentsia is more noticeable now. Is this the case? Viktor Grigoriyevich Afanasyev replies:

[Begin Afanasyev recording] Indeed, the intelligentsia, especially those in journalism [publitsistika], representatives of the mass media, are in the front ranks of restructuring. I could give several reasons for this. First of all this means the central press: It is the most active. We are all closer to the headquarters of restructuring, the Central Committee of our party, the leadership of our party. Democratic traditions are strong with us, because it is a collegium which directs the press organs: The editor in chief is not a single master of this or that organ, this or that paper, this or that magazine. We are very closely connected with the people. For example, Pravda gets 700-750,000 letters a year. We hold readers' conferences, we conduct sociological research (?as to) what stage activity is at in the workers' milieu and among the peasants.

I must say that restructuring has aroused a great outburst in the activity of workers, peasants, women, and young people. You can judge by the letters to the editor. It used to be the case, let's say, that there were a lot of letters of an individual nature: This one asking for a flat, that one wrongly fired or a relation had been wrongly sentenced—the most varied questions, of an individual kind. Now there are a lot of letters of public significance, when people—people it's the custom to call simple people, people in the street—workers and peasants write and express a public interest, the interest of their collective. This is very noticeable in the post.

They write to us: Comrade leaders!—evidently they write the same thing to the Central Committee—do not stop half way; take things to their conclusion; don't let restructuring be stifled. [end recording]

No 'Fundamental' Differences

PM2806093388 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondents A. Alekhin, A. Mizinov, and V. Shishlin: "Components of Democracy"]

[Text] The crowded hall of the 19th party conference press center is further testimony to the unflagging interest of the world's mass media in the processes of democratization and glasnost in Soviet society—very important components of revolutionary restructuring. On 27 June representatives of the Soviet and foreign press had an opportunity to meet with leaders of leading party press organs and of creative unions.

The press conference was chaired by Yu.A. Sklyarov, leader of the conference press center and chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department. V.G. Afanasyev, chairman of the USSR Journalists Union Board and chief editor of PRAVDA, was the first to take the floor. He spoke of the editorial office's work and of the approaches by which it is guided in choosing the subjects of newspaper articles. He believes that the materials' objectivity and competence are guaranteed by the collective principle of their evaluation and by the staffers' high responsibility and professional skill.

While pointing out that many sharp, problem-centered articles have appeared recently in the Soviet press, at the same time V.G. Afanasyev voiced concern in connection with the excessive—in his opinion—passion for critical materials. You will not get far by criticism alone, he said, and it is necessary to reveal the progressive experience of restructuring. We strive to find a constructive solution to urgent problems, while not, of course, rejecting criticism of negative phenomena.

There are undoubted successes in the sphere of glasnost and democracy—this is the opinion of N.B. Bikkenin, chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST. He pointed to the emergence of competitiveness in the press as a positive trend.

The journal's leader emphasized that the party's capacity for self-critical analysis not only of the past but also of what has been done over the past 3 years must be demonstrated at the conference. The party forum is to formulate reliable political guarantees that the mistakes of the period of the personality cult and of stagnation will not be repeated. And we cannot manage here with some single means—a package of measures is needed. This is the chief question facing us—the Soviet person must not be alienated from power. Alienation occurred in the thirties, when institutions of people's power formally existed, but their real substance had been emasculated. A person can feel responsible to society only when he feels he shoulders the burden of power.

The speaker pointed to a number of serious shortcomings in the party's ideological work. I cannot forget a television program in which an outstanding weaver who had been elected a soviet deputy thanked the party for the trust shown in her, he said. Yet it is not the working class that needs the party's trust but the other way round—the party must merit the people's trust.

As at previous news conferences, Western journalists once again raised the subject of so-called "disagreements in the Soviet leadership." People in the West, V.G. Afanasyev said, devote too much attention to the question of the contradictions that supposedly exist in the higher echelon. I have repeatedly attended CPSU Central Committee Politburo sessions, PRAVDA's chief editor pointed out, and I can say that fundamental political contradictions do not exist. No one in the leadership doubts the need for restructuring, but there is, of course, a normal discussion of specific forms, methods, means, and times. Every session participant can express his own viewpoint.

Replying to a question on the impact of restructuring on the development of the Soviet theater, M.A. Ulyanov pointed out that creative associations have completely rid themselves of ministerial tutelage and of the situation whereby officials decided the fate of dramatic works. Today, he said, we ourselves choose and realize our own repertoire. In the interests of the struggle against red tape we do not want to increase the number of creative unions but are trying to create within those that already exist conditions for pluralism and for the expression of different artistic solutions.

Replying to a question on interaction among national cultures, V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board, agreed that work in this area in the past was of a purely representative and frequently pompous nature. Now, he emphasized, the situation is changing, and we seek cooperation on a platform of businesslike, frank dialogue.

Press Center Head Sklyarov on Conference Work

LD2706215488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] [Announcer] The party conference is attracting great attention from the international press. Applications for accreditation have come in from journalists from 77 foreign states. Hundreds of Soviet correspondents will be covering its work.

In the press center on 27 June there was talk about the order of work of the conference and about how to report on events more accurately and efficiently. Journalists were interested in why there won't be a complete relay as was requested by many people in letters and speeches.

Yuriy Aleksandrovich Sklyarov, press center leader and Propaganda Department chief, answered these questions:

[Begin Sklyarov recording] This is a party conference, a conference which is devoted to the discussion of most important questions, many of which are complicated questions which need to be put to very serious discussion. New laws and new systems have begun to be implemented, in the economic sphere, in the social sphere, and in other spheres of our society's life. That is, we suppose that this conference will proceed in both sharp and analytical fashion. It is not ruled out, moreover, that conference delegates will speak optionally, with, so-to-speak, absolutely thoroughly proven, perhaps, appraisals, data and proposals. That is, there ought here to be a right to a certain prognosis, to a certain search for the truth; a wish to consult others; to express, perhaps, some kind of opinion which is not yet very mature but which really disturbs a person and which he must bring to the general forum. That is, the entire environment of the work of the conference ought to be such so that it does not bind a person: so that he should not feel pressure from, first and foremost, the fact that he is in everybody's sight and should literally watch his every word and every gesture; and that he ought first and foremost to think about the essence of the question with which he has come and for the sake of which he is taking part in this discussion.

I think that each one of you, in the role of a speaker, will agree that an atmosphere of total openness and relaying of everything which is taking place does not incline everyone in full measure to dare to discuss most secret questions, many of which are still perhaps for the individual not finally matured and not finally formed. I think that this needs to be respected, the more so since we are trying to report to a maximum all data about how the discussion is proceeding—what conclusions the conference is drawing, and what delegates are proposing—to the public, the party, the nonparty mass, our foreign friends and to the public abroad who display an interest. I think that during the last few years and months many comrades, many foreign journalists and our colleagues have been convinced that we now speak very frankly—about our weaknesses, shortcomings and problems—and therefore it does not become us to conceal our difficulties and weaknesses and in any case we will not do that. [end recording]

[Announcer] Journalists were also briefed on the kind of mechanism that has been created to count votes. For this procedure the hall of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses has been divided into eight sectors where the counters will be working. All of the work of the party conference will be reflected in documentary-accurate shorthand reports. Cinema and television films will be made. It is proposed to publish detailed texts of speeches in PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA newspapers and to publish in the local press the speeches of their envoys.

The participants in the news conference were informed that a mandate commission will report on the composition of delegations at the party conference. But one can already say today that frontranking workers and kolkhoz

workers have traveled to Moscow; significantly more of the intelligentsia than at party congresses have been selected, and less on this occasion of party and local soviet workers.

Briefings will be organized after every day of the conference's work in the press center.

Political & Social

More Demonstrations Occur in Nagorno-Karabakh

Stepanakert 27 Jun Report

PM2806103788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6

[S. Oganyan report under the "Stop Press" rubric: "Stepanakert, 27 June"]

[Text] Yesterday I traveled to Victory Square in a fixed-route cab. Even on Sunday this was impossible—public transport was not working in Stepanakert. Now the Passenger Motor Transport Association collective has returned to work. We couldn't drive into the square itself—despite the early hour, we were met by a 1,000-strong column of demonstrators. A rally had begun at approximately 1000 hours.

At the rally there were calls to stop the strike. Correct words were said about restructuring, the 19th CPSU Conference, and the hopes pinned on it.... And at that moment at someone's command, approximately one-half of the meeting participants again set off on a procession through the city streets. The leaders of enterprises and organizations crowded on the roof of the oblast laboratory of the State Committee for the Supervision of Standards and Measuring Equipment, which is now serving as the rostrum for rallies, tried in vain to halt the column, and read out telegrams from Moscow's Armenians asking the Karabakh people to return to their enterprises....

As I was sending this piece to the editorial office, some of the rally participants went off to their enterprises together with their leaders.

At noon I called the obkom and asked: What changes are there? Approximately one-half of the footwear factory collective has begun work, and a little more than that at the local industry combine.

NKAO Soviet Resolution

LD2706134688 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2030 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] As we reported earlier, an extraordinary session of the Nagorno-Karabakh [Autonomous] Oblast [NKAO] Soviet was held 21 June. The following is emphasized in the resolution adopted by the session:

A thorough and detailed examination of the decisions of the highest organs of state authority in Azerbaijan leads one to the inevitable conclusion that both the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet and Supreme Soviet Presidium lack a proper understanding of the meaning and content of the 20 February 1988 decision of the Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. Their reply concerning the unacceptability of this decision is more reminiscent of blithe hopefulness than of a juridical act of the highest organs of state authority of an SSR. Otherwise, their refusal to recognize an act directed at implementing the Leninist principle of free self-determination of nations is in no way compatible with the calling of the highest organs of state authority of an SSR.

The Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast Soviet declares its disagreement with the 13 June 1988 resolutions of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Presidium and the 17 June 1988 resolutions of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet on the mediation of oblast Soviet deputies for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan to Armenia. Taking into account the tense situation that has developed, expressing the will of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh, and basing itself on the necessity of consistently implementing the Leninist principle of free self-determination of nations which lies at the foundations of the national and state structure of our united, all-union, and multinational state, the Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast Soviet considers it necessary to apply urgently and once more to the USSR Supreme Soviet to ask that the 15 June resolution of the Armenian Supreme Soviet—which has agreed to accept Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's joining Armenia—and the 20 February resolution of the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies to transfer Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast from Azerbaijan to the Armenian Republic, be examined with the greatest possible attention, and that the matter be settled in the oblast so it may return to a normal working rhythm. The Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast Soviet requests that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium hand the administration of the autonomous oblast over to the Soviet Government on a temporary basis at the earliest possible date pending the final and positive solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem, as this is the only acceptable alternative at present.

The Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast Soviet session has interceded with the USSR Supreme Court to ask, in light of the necessity for a political, legal, and principled assessment of the events in Sumgait and of the malicious distortion of the massive anti-state crimes, banditry, and mass disturbances, that the court take over the proceedings concerning these crimes and—as a court of the first instance—objectively try them and pass severe, but just sentences in the name of the Soviet Union.

Tatar Protesters Arrested in Tashkent, Moscow

900 Barred From Moscow

AU2706135688 Paris AFP in English 1350 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, June 27 (AFP)—About 900 Tatars have been turned away from Moscow in the past few days while another 500 Tatars were arrested Sunday at a

big demonstration in Tashkent for the right to a national homeland in the Crimea, a Tatar nationalist leader said.

The Tatars, from all over the Soviet Union, had converged on Moscow intending to publicise their cause during the Communist Party Federal Conference opening on Tuesday, Reshat Zhemilev, a leading Tatar activist, said by telephone from Tashkent. He said a great many Tatars were injured Sunday when police brutally dispersed a protest by 20,000 Tatars in Tashkent, the capital of the Central Asian Republic of Uzbekistan. Mr Zhemilev said militiamen had clubbed demonstrators at random including pregnant women and elderly people. He said several demonstrators had needed hospital treatment.

Police arrested 500 of the demonstrators, who were protesting against a state commission's rejection of their demand for an autonomous republic in the Crimea. Mr Zhemilev said he himself had been held for several hours before being released. He could not say how many others had been freed. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Against Changes

AU2806101488 Paris AFP in English 1002 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 28 (AFP)—About 40 Crimean Tatars were arrested Tuesday morning in Moscow as they attempted to demonstrate in Pushkin Square, in the centre of the capital, as the special Communist Party conference was getting under way, one of their spokesman said. Policemen, out in force since early Tuesday, seized banners and placards displayed and took the demonstrators away in coaches a few minutes after they started their protest, Ilme Umerov said. The banners called for "a homeland for the Tatars", deported by Stalin from the Crimea to Central Asia for alleged collaboration with the Nazis during World War II. The banners also criticized a ruling by a Government commission, announced on June 9, which rejected calls by the Tatars for the re-establishment of an autonomous Crimean republic, Mr. Umerov said.

At the same time, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev was telling delegates attending the party conference here that he ruled out the possibility of changing internal boundaries.

Tajik, Uzbek Leaders View Interethnic Ties

PM2306140788 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 88 p 2

[Own correspondent A. Ganelin report: "Brothers Should Not Hold Grudges"]

[Text] Speeches on friendship between our countries' peoples, similar to toasts, were typical during the period of stagnation. Festivals and celebrations accompanied by tumultuous applause took place one after the other. It seemed that all problems of interethnic relations had happened a long time ago. Only now do we see where this "slogan" friendship leads.

And today, in the period of restructuring, when we are reinterpreting much of what has happened and we are looking once again at interethnic relations, a representative delegation from Uzbekistan led by R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the republic party Central Committee, visited the republic at the invitation of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee.

The Tajik and Uzbek peoples, who are tied to each other not only by economic but also creative and cultural traditions, have long been called brothers. Many Tajiks live in Uzbekistan, and many Uzbeks live in Tajikistan. When the guests had visited Tajik cities, villages and construction sites, they met with representatives of the republic's intelligentsia and public, trying to jointly resolve the important question—how to make the friendship even stronger? How to prevent anything from spoiling it?..

In the East guests are usually accustomed to saying only pleasant things, avoiding delicate subjects, even if they do exist. This "Oriental" tradition of talking only about pleasant things—victories and successes—existed in the country for a long time.

But this time tradition was broken. The meeting's participants realized that friendship will be even stronger if problems and shortcomings are talked about openly. But this conversation must be entirely good-natured and constructive.

Many representatives of the Tajik intelligentsia spoke in Uzbek at the meeting, recalling how they had learned in this republic about their comrades and colleagues from Uzbekistan. They talked about the numerous families where people from the two republics had become related. Yes, experience of fraternal contact does exist, but there are also problems. Let us resolve them calmly as brothers should. Listing grudges is not the way out but leads to a dead end. This was the basic idea that was heard at the meeting. Instead of castigating people, the mistakes should be corrected.

So, without any kind of pomposity or sloganizing, sensation or toasts to friendship, specific proposals were worked out on how to strengthen friendship between the peoples. For example, shooting a joint movie on the two republics' historical monuments, setting up genuine contacts between labor collectives, and jointly resolving the region's ecological problems. The republic Komsomol's proposal is to organize a joint pioneer camp of the "Arteka" type for young people from Tajikistan and Uzbekistan and to send school children on an exchange, so that they live with Uzbek and Tajik families.

Many ideas were expressed whose implementation is meant not for the distant future but literally for tomorrow. Work has already begun today to organize the Central Asian "Arteka" with the participation of the Tajik and Uzbek Komsomol Central Committees.

Estonia's Ryuytel on Justice for Stalin's Victims
LD2406081488 Moscow TASS in English 0749 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Tallinn June 24 TASS—One of the purposes of the commission for the elaboration of legislative measures connected with further democratisation of social life is to restore justice with regard to persons who guiltlessly suffered in the period of the Stalin personality cult. The commission, headed by Estonia's president Arnold Ryuytel, has begun its work under the authority of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia, a Soviet Baltic republic.

"The reorganization process in the republic awakens the social activity of an increasing number of people", Arnold Ryuytel said in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

"The commission", he went on to say, "discusses the proposals that come in from all over the republic. They concern the elaboration and realisation of new ways for economic development and democratisation in Estonia".

"We now speak with anguish about the arbitrariness and lawlessness of the days of the personality cult", Arnold Ryuytel pointed out. "For this never to recur, it is essential to strengthen the real power of the people, to take the public opinion into account more widely, to listen to requirements which are being put forward by social currents, organizations, various associations of creative intellectuals and young people, which have already been brought into being by the current restructuring process and which are taking shape in Estonia".

"At present the Presidium of the Estonia Supreme Soviet takes steps to reconsider the acts under the provisions of which thousands of people were repressed and deported from Estonia 47 years ago", Arnold Ryuytel said.

Kolbin, Suleymenov Discuss Changes in Kazakhstan
PM2406150188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 88 Morning Edition p2

[Conversation between G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, and O.O. Suleymenov, first secretary of the Kazakh Writers Union Board, both of whom are "delegates to the 19th all-union party conference," under the heading "Politics Is the Art of the Possible"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Suleymenov] Gennadiy Vasilyevich, there is certainly no need to prove that we are living in a time of major change. This change is noticeable here in Kazakhstan. But the pace of restructuring is not the same in every sphere of social life. Evidently, this is natural. The sporting principle—who is the fastest?—applied in politics has proved to be unproductive.

Some determined administrators also went about restructuring at a gallop at first. So the situation had to be clarified: "Act decisively, but with circumspection!" Three years is a sufficient length of time for summing up the first results. The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference have become a program for nationwide dialogue, the essence of which must be reflected in concentrated form at the Communists' forum. You yourself are preparing to address this forum. It is hardly possible to express the entire range of your new knowledge of Kazakhstan in a 10-minute speech. You have been working in the republic since December 1986....

[Kolbin] We cannot say that restructuring in Kazakhstan began in December 1986. As in the rest of the country, its starting point was April 1985. Of course, the question of who is the fastest is not the main issue here; but slowness—when we are faced with solving tasks of nation's existence [narodnoye bytiye] determining socialist consciousness—is unforgiveable.

The path of restructuring is not strewn with roses. We are fighting our way through bureaucratic obstructions, old, stereotyped ways of thinking, and the clinging atmosphere of corruption and mutual protection, and are having to overcome passivity, indifference, and social apathy. All these and other difficulties are clearly and concisely reflected in the well-known CPSU Central Committee resolution on the work of our republic's party organization. The concepts of patriotism and internationalism are not treated in isolation in this resolution but rather in their interconnection with a broad range of phenomena influencing the quality of our life. And then, almost a year later, on 4 June, at a scheduled plenum, we discussed how this document is being implemented.

On the threshold of the 19th conference we can see very clearly that improvement in national and interethnic relations coupled with economic reform and the development of democracy are decisive factors in the restructuring process. A great deal now depends on how carefully Communists and all working people in our multiethnic country treat the friendship between our peoples. There is no doubt that this friendship is an invaluable attribute. But friendship between peoples is subject to the influence of social injustice and other stress factors. We had assumed that the ideological and class tempering resulting from the storms in our history would reliably guarantee the integrity of our friendship. But it has become clear that the wet chill blowing from our distant past can affect the spiritual health of our society. The revival of relic views has been helped by the atmosphere of an authoritarian regime and individual power and the resulting situation in which the masses found themselves—without rights and without a voice. Now we are trying to put the situation to rights, having

finally realized that the multiethnic nature of our state does not constitute internationalism but is only the necessary foundation for its creation.

[Suleymenov] Some people believe that nationalist demonstrations are the result of restructuring. Everything used to be fine, they say, everyone lived in harmony together and now nationalism has reared its head in Kazakhstan, the Baltic region, and the Transcaucasus. You worked for 8 years in Georgia, which is a multiethnic republic, and then in Ulyanovsk Oblast, where the population is not purely Russian. To say nothing of Kazakhstan. So you are well familiar with the subject of interethnic relations. What, in your opinion, are the causes of this exacerbation of national feelings we have witnessed?

[Kolbin] Many problems, primarily social, were not solved in good time and, as the years passed, became that much more difficult to resolve. The democratization process has made it possible to bring these issues into the open and, what is more, express them in a sharper form. The mass nature of their expression has given social problems a national slant in a number of areas. On the other hand, I do not rule out the possibility that an organizational role has been played by people who do not find restructuring to their liking. Cunningly speculating on national feeling, they stir up emotions, arouse old resentments, and thereby create new ones.

People are still asking us who exactly is the organizer behind the nationalist demonstrations in Kazakhstan? We stated quite clearly at the recent plenum that there certainly has never been any underground organization and no such organization exists now! But there has been something else—opposition to restructuring from people who have worked their way into the upper echelons of party and state administration—but not on the basis of any merit. I must definitely add at this point that there were people from various ethnic groups among the opponents of restructuring who provoked the riots in Alma-Ata. This is all the more reason not to say the Kazakh people are nationalist. These events cannot cancel out the friendship nurtured by the many generations of people from various ethnic groups who have lived and live in Kazakhstan.

In our socialist conditions there are no insoluble situations in interethnic relations. Patient work by party, state, and social organizations is the guarantee that a humane, democratic solution will be found to any problem, even a problem in "deadlock." Politics has always been the art of the possible: This fact should be borne in mind by everyone—advocates of restructuring and its opponents. We have often moved from an idea to a future fact, completely ignoring reality. This has led to national dramas. Given the size of our country, egoism in individual persons can develop on an unpredictable scale dangerous to the democratization process.

[Suleymenov] The old methods are probably ineffectual in situations out of the ordinary....

[Kolbin] New approaches are coming through more and more strongly in present-day practice. For example, the people in Kazakhstan now judge the solution of one of the most difficult problems—the food problem—not by plan results but by the food available in the stores (after all, the plans often used to be overfulfilled but the shelves were still empty). We judge the solution of the second most important social problem—housing—by the rate at which people on the housing waiting list are being given an apartment. Consumer goods production is being judged on the basis of the cash plan results. In other words, we are not judging the situation by the abstract "control figures" to which the people have long been indifferent, but by the real end results which people can appreciate. These results have an effect on people's mood. In the last 2 years, for example, meat consumption per capita in the republic has increased by 6 kg. This year it is our intention to add another 4 kg to this figure and thereby reach the level of per capita meat consumption set by the Food Program for 1990. Last year we completed the housing construction plan by November and are continuing to maintain this pace, which means that tens of thousands of Kazakh families who were to have received apartments in 1989-1990 are already celebrating their housewarmings.

[Suleymenov] The CPSU Central Committee Theses discuss the demarcation of functions of party and state bodies. The solution of social problems—as we can all see for ourselves—is having a positive impact on interethnic relations, but what purposeful measures are being taken with regard to international education?

[Kolbin] Refusing to act as substitutes for soviet and economic bodies certainly does not ease the burden of party committees. Quite the reverse, really. Party political work has been thoroughly neglected in recent decades. This is particularly true of the ideological sphere of party activity and, in particular, work to control national and interethnic relations. It is no secret that precisely in this area of work we often seem to find ourselves "on the defensive."

A definite system of managing interethnic relations is now evolving in Kazakhstan. For the first time commissions, sections, and subdepartments responsible for interethnic relations are being established using existing staff in party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol bodies. Their aim is to study and resolve national problems within the competence of the body concerned. For example, in restructuring conditions the intelligentsia has become more concerned about developing national languages, and their alarm for the vitality of these languages is sometimes well founded. Some people who think in the old way choose to regard this as a sign of nationalism. A nation's natural desire to preserve its own linguistic culture coupled with a recognition of the

objective need for a means of interethnic communication has long resulted in real national-Russian bilingualism. Bilingualism is now a major aspect of our language policy. Few people would doubt that this is right although the methods of establishing this in practice are still imperfect and give rise to dispute. This is normal. The important thing is that we believe unconcern should not be tolerated on any issue.

If, for example, one rayon is short of teachers of the native language, another is short of textbooks, and another does not have the type for printing newspapers in the native language, and so forth, who is to blame? It is the fault of those people whose job it is to solve these problems in good time. It is now within the competence of the people working in the new structures to remind them of their duty and call them to account.

[Suleymenov] Everyone is now alarmed by the situation in Karabakh....

[Kolbin] We are learning to live in democratic conditions in a multiethnic country—everywhere people are looking for ways to galvanize institutions in the political system through which national interests must be more objectively revealed and harmonized. But in such a way that they do not negate each other. Circumspection, mutual respect, and political tact must come before determination in the solution of these problems. We must be prepared for the possibility of extreme attitudes arising in other regions also and if we are to remove the causes we must—as proposed in the CPSU Central Committee Theses—consider measures at the conference to further develop the Soviet federation.

[Suleymenov] Elections of leaders at state enterprises are considered one of the main manifestations of socialist democracy. I stress "socialist," since managers are not elected in capitalist countries. But here is an observation. You will often hear unobjective terms at meetings—he's a "good guy," "a decent type," "he's got a sense of humor," or the reverse. Often preference is given to a "good guy" rather than to a specialist, which takes its toll on the success of production. One can understand the weariness with dull bureaucrats who are affable with the higher-ups but who are rude to their subordinates. I think that most people today vote for a leader who is humane but also competent. He must be a first-class specialist so that he can assess others' capabilities. Cadres are being substantially renewed in the republic. At present more are being appointed than elected. There are many well-known cases where collectives do not accept leaders who have a bad knowledge of the business.

[Kolbin] Yes, there are many such cases. Many leaders not only lack competence but also political skills and the ability to work with people in conditions of expanding democracy and glasnost. In this respect the provisions of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise regarding the election of leaders and the use of a system of competition for selecting and replacing leader specialists must be fulfilled without fail.

The time is compelling us to take note of and attach importance to what was previously considered nonessential. So we have begun to talk about "official" and "unofficial" leaders. I have had occasion to observe people following a leader who doesn't have an official post but refusing to follow a man who holds a party post. In my opinion, a person in whom people have lost confidence, a person who solemnly utters correct truths but doesn't know how to apply these truths to the matter in hand has more difficulty in restructuring himself. A leader is not a leader merely by virtue of his office, and a realization of this will compel all officials to work in such a way that the title of leader may accord with their job and their appointment will match what they are earmarked for. Even now that we have embarked on the second phase of restructuring, we are still guided by the following principle when selecting cadres: If a man has done nothing bad in the area from which we are promoting him, that is good.... Society is only just beginning democratic elections. We have all at once required a vast quantity of modern-minded specialist leaders in all levels of production and... a shortage of such has come to light. Such people are in short supply! There is one way out: While consistently developing the democratic principle, we must train specialist managers at the same time. Then the entire body of cadres will be gradually improved as we go along.

[Suleymenov] The formation of national working class detachments has also been assigned to the commissions on interethnic relations. Sociologists have calculated that in the last 50 years the percentage of Kazakhs employed in industry has dropped constantly.

[Kolbin] I think that sociologists are not quite right. They are possibly not taking into consideration the changes which have taken place in the concepts of the "working class" and the "peasantry." Is a machine operator, that is a tractor driver, a combine operator, or a driver transporting grain or feed a peasant or a worker? Are such workers different from a milling machine operator at an industrial giant or an urban driver who lives in a rural area. Kazakhs now form 52 percent of the overall total of people working in agriculture in the republic. But there is a chronic shortage of cadres there. At the same time such sectors as ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy and the coal industry have their full complement of cadres. In this situation is there any point in organizing the "transfer" of people from rural areas into industry solely to increase the relevant indicators for sociologists? The formation of a national working class is an important task. But we must set about resolving it by considering the entire series of factors, so that form does not prevail over content.

We are also taking into consideration the fact that approximately 300,000 rural inhabitants are virtually not involved in the social production sphere but nor do they want to leave their native areas. It has been decided to meet them halfway and "bring work" to people. That is, develop a broad network of branches of enterprises producing consumer goods in those regions with a surplus work force.

[Suleymenov] The public of certain republics, in particular the Baltic republics, insistently raise the question of transferring the republics to economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet]—this would mean considerable decentralization.

[Kolbin] Of course, it is absurd when Moscow has to worry about how many clothespins are manufactured in Kokchetav. Economically accountable republics are our future: The family and team contracts and economically accountable enterprises will inevitably become larger economically accountable systems. This is possibly easier for the Baltic region and more difficult for us since many factors are of importance here—the number of economic units, their size, the territory, and even the traditions of economic activity, and so on.

At meetings where delegates were elected to the party conference, people inquired what platform we are taking to Moscow and what ideas and positions we will be defending. The cornerstones of our position are to strive for a sharp improvement in food supplies, provide each family with an individual apartment more speedily, strengthen the friendship between the peoples, and affirm democratic norms. But this position has one fundamental characteristic. We can ourselves by our own efforts to a considerable extent secure the requisite changes and make a fitting contribution to strengthening our motherland's economic potential. This conviction is based on scrupulous scientific analysis of our potentials and the prospects for economic activity.

But economic independence [ekonomicheskaya samostoyatelnost] for the republic is not a matter of the notorious philosophy of shunning originality [samobytnost]. A subsistence economy is absurd within the global structures of modern civilization. The republics are organs in the single socioeconomic organism of the country. The parts and the whole cannot function properly without reasonable linkage. This is a historic reality which we all need to clearly realize. People must be made aware straight out of school of the economic indissolubility of the Soviet federation of peoples. This helps the citizen to understand his part in the common cause and experience the "sense of being a single family." These words have not aged or become obliterated because such an all-Soviet family does exist.

[Suleymenov] It may seem strange that I am asking you questions like a correspondent who has just arrived although the changes in the republic are taking place before my eyes. But I will not hide the fact that I would like you to point out in your answers the great work of social planning being carried out by Kazakhstan's party organization just now....

[Kolbin] ...Let me add: The work is being carried out with the active participation of all the public, including Kazakhstan's writers. This is not merely a mutual exchange of pleasantries. The writers are actively supporting restructuring through their books, plays, and journalistic articles in the press and through meetings with labor collectives. I count the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Bureau as such a collective. We are taking part in quite heated discussions with writers at Writers Union plenums and at party meetings. These now traditional meetings are helping to clarify mutual stances and correct views on complex phenomena in our activity—this opinion is also shared by my comrades from the Central Committee Bureau. It is no secret that artists have a highly developed sense of justice and disagreement with the status quo. Constant dissatisfaction with one's achievements to date is characteristic of the creator and is the force which leads to revolutionary transformations. The apparatus, and that means many of us, lacks that sense of dissatisfaction: The apparatus, unfortunately, often endeavored to suppress doubts or, God forbid, other opinions. That is why the return on the republic's intellectual potential dropped. The gamble on infallible science, incontestable literature and art did not pay off. It must be practice and life itself that must pass judgment on creative ideas. We have come to this conclusion only with difficulty. I admit that we party workers needed the general secretary's persistent example and the experience and tone of his dialogues with the creative intelligentsia in order to to understand all this.

[Suleymenov] Those meetings helped change our view of pluralism of opinion. This is especially important for regions where ideology was "controlled." I will not say that "concessions" occured straightaway, for not all party workers have agreed to resign themselves to newspapers' and journals' "freethinking".... Let's pin our hopes on the mechanism of adaptation....

[Kolbin] It is generally time to realize that it is simply impossible for mankind to live normally without the development of the capacity to think freely and freely express his views—unrestricted by prohibitions. We must all help to construct a society which is genuinely socialist in the Leninist interpretation of the word. We all hope that this kind of creative atmosphere of emancipated thought and free speech will be present at the conference.

Yevtushenko Hails Non-Party 'People's Front'

PM2306113888 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 24, 12 Jun 88 p 10

[Article by Yevgeniy Yevtushenko: "The Party of Non-Party People"]

[Text] There is such a party. This party has no Politbureau, no regional, no district committees. It is not

organized and therefore weak, but it is not overorganized and therefore strong. The party of non-Party people is strong in that it has no nomenclature (a special body of administrators by profession who can be assigned to manage the local transport system today or the health-preservation organization tomorrow—Ed). By the part of non-Party people I don't mean just any public plankton, but rather those who, together with the best Party members, belong to the People's Front of Perestroyka, which has not been organized as yet, but still really exists.

This People's Front is not just a front of resistance to bureaucracy, but a front of attack on it. It is a front of struggle against the dark ghosts of the past so that they will not be reborn at the present. It is the front of struggle for such a life in our country when we wouldn't feel ashamed of a single queue. The Communist Party will not be able to win this struggle without mighty support from the party of non-Party people. The party of non-Party people is bigger than the Communist Party and has not as yet fully recognized itself as a historical force.

In the word "non-Party person" the jugglers of personnel packs hear the word "uncontrollable", which throws a scare into them. But history shows that many of its tragedies and crimes happened precisely due to "controllable" people, and the so-called uncontrollable people quite often happen to be the real heroes of history. A man easily controlled by bureaucracy is, essentially, an antipatriot, because bureaucracy is a war against one's own people. And a man who is controlled by his own conscience, even if he is a non-Party person, is not a non-Party man, because he is in the party of the people.

Whether or not a person is a Party member does not define him morally. The Party is also full of public plankton. We remember from our childhood the expression "the Party is the vanguard of the working class". But this formula should not be used to place each Party member in the vanguard and each non-Party person—in the rear guard. Beria was also a Party member, but he may be put only in the vanguard of scoundrels. The Party card is not as yet a reference on advanced thinking, or a pure conscience. The Party card in itself cannot serve as a pass to the first rows of our society, because then the first rows may, imperceptibly for themselves, turn out to be the last rows. In such a case, according to the tough, but correct words of Lenin "our Party may now find itself in a very dangerous position—the position of a man with a swelled head. It is a very stupid, shameful and ridiculous position" (from a speech delivered at a meeting in honour of Lenin's 50th birthday, April 23, 1920).

Let's go back to the expression "vanguard of the working class". At the present stage of the modern society this expression has widened, because our intelligentsia is not some elite, torn away from the working class, but represents a spiritual working class. A real intellectual has bloody corns not on his hands, but on his heart. Were not the non-Party Tsiolkovskiy, Vavilov, Chayanov and Andrey Platonov the vanguard of the spiritual working class? Can we remove from the vanguard of the working class the non-Party Academicians who fearlessly entered the contaminated zones in Chernobyl? Can we exclude from the vanguard of the working class the non-Party teachers, physicians, medical nurses or, let's say, a non-Party member, a 100-per-cent honest grey-haired bookkeeper, who handles billions upon billions of roubles while receiving a tiny wage? And isn't the army of the working class, called "employees"—the working class?

Does the possession of a pure conscience, even in the absence of a Party card, mean not being in the vanguard? Aren't our best writers, artists and actors, about whose easy life there are so many envious stories, not the vanguard of the working class? (To shame those who invent these stories, I'll say that the average monthly wage of members of the Union of Soviet Writers is 162 roubles.) And our long-suffering, tormented and maimed peasantry, the best sons of which miraculously managed to preserve their connection with the tormented motherland—isn't this the vanguard of the working class? Why were the comers from plants and factories, many of whom never held earth in their hands, assigned to teach the farmers how to plough and sow, thus putting the peasantry into a lower class situation as compared with the workers?

The disrespect for peasantry was artfully disguised by filling all sorts of presidiums with people like the tongueless Mariya Demchenko, or Mamlakat Nakhangova, by films like the "Pig Tender and the Shepherd" or the "Kuban Cossacks". But Aleksey Stakhanov, that wonderful man who was torn away from his own jackhammer and promoted "to the top" as a public model creating a show of dictatorship of the proletariat—he was also tongue-tied. The dictatorship of the proletariat was really replaced by the dictatorship of bureaucracy. The phrase "the Party is the vanguard of the working class" became a hypocrisy with Stalin and those who surrounded him, because they, while annihilating both Party members and non-Party people, made both the Party and the people tongue-tied. Within the Party the party of mediocrities triumphed. Film director Mikhail Kalatozov told me that Stalin liked very much the US film about an old pirate who used to lock himself in a state-room and play chess with himself. He had a set of chessmen, made of bread, which looked very much like other pirates. When the old pirate threw a figure he lost off the board, he was killing one more of his accessories. At long last, the pirate was left alone and, laughing madly and gulping from a bottle, he steered his ship right at a dimly visible iceberg. In spite of the Politbureau members' pleas that they were tired, Stalin made them watch the film for a second time. "It's an instructive film," he said, slightly grinning.

Stalin, after destroying the best revolutionary cadres and later destroying many of those who had destroyed them, held the party apparatus in fear, but at the same time

bribed it-with all sorts of privileges-special shops, special rations, dachas, personal cars and, lastly, by "blue envelopes" (a monthly taxless salary). Stalin and his entourage got corrupted themselves and morally corrupted the Party. Stalin's personal ascetism, modesty and selflessness is a myth. The morals and talent of the Party members dropped drastically. The admittance to the Party in 1941-42, when those who went into battle at the hour of mortal danger wrote—"Count me a Communist"—was salutarily refreshing. During the war, the facet between Party and non-Party people was erased-everyone was in the general party of Victory. But after the Victory the difference in promoting Party members as against non-Party people to responsible posts was again beginning to be felt very sharply. More and more career seekers got into the Party. Many talented people did not want to join the Party because, together with the possibility of quick promotion, this also meant greater dependence and enslavement.

After the 20th Congress fresh forces came to the Party, hoping to actively help democratization from within the Party. They had a hard time: some got broken, turned cynical, or sold themselves. But the more staunch ones, gritting their teeth from shame, did not lose hope for a revolutionary perestroyka but fostered it in themselves. It was precisely these people who turned the ship of the fatherland from the bog of stagnation to the high seas of glasnost. But many had become rotten themselves, so that we cannot expect from them passionate love for the stormy waves of glasnost-they know they might be washed overboard. There are such cowards-waiters-among non-Party people, too.

The division line is no longer between Party and non-Party people, but between the fighters for perestroyka and its saboteurs. The saboteurs wrote the so-called letter by Nina Andreyeva. They tried to veto the film "Repetance" and quite recently the TV film "Process". They are trying to stifle the cooperatives by taxes and all sorts of other limitations. They invisibly bless the anti-Semitic flare-ups. What are they so afraid of and why are they trying to scare others? Because with glasnost a terrible state secret might be uncovered-their own lack of talent and inability to lead.

Ever more talented people are coming into the party, including to leading posts. Many are joining it to help perestroyka and to fight its opponents inside the Party. But the leaden ballast of career seekers exists and will continue to exist in the Party as long as privileges in terms of promotion within the administration and the service industry continues on the basis of the red Party card rather than ability. The Party becomes weaker when membership in it rids non-Party people of equality with Party members. The state itself becomes pauperized, robbed of its own cadres when it doesn't trust the leading posts of ministers, directors of industrial enterprises to the most talented non-Party people. Why cannot one of the vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers be a non-Party man? Only one—S. Zalygin—is a non-Party man among all the editors of the central papers and magazines. Can it be that our working people are building two different socialisms-one for Party members and the other-for non-Party people?

The believers are part of the non-Party party. At the opening celebration of the Millennium of Christianity in Rus, an important world cultural event, the leaders of the Orthodox Church met with the leaders of our Party and expressed their support for perestroyka. The holy words on the freedom of faith are written in the Constitution, therefore, freedom of faith is constitutional and any persecution of the believers illegal. Expulsion from the Komsomol or the Party not for faith, but just for visiting the church, getting married in church or baptizing should be seen now as a remnant of the 20s, hopelessly out-of-date. As for the party of non-Party people, is it really impossible to believe in God and socialism t the same time? The freedom to be an atheist must also be part of the freedom of faith. Overthrowing vulgar theories, history has shown us that religious feelings are not necessarily incompatible with patriotism and civic conscience. The Russian Orthodox Church, blessing our troops, raised the money for defence; some believers even offered their wedding rings. In the Irkutsk synagogue there is a wall with an eternal fire burning, and on the wall of marble are the names of believer-Jews who fell fighting nazism. Together with them Moslems from Central Asia, Catholics and Protestants from the Baltic Republics fought like brothers. Now all the churches in our country are most active in the struggle for peace, for nuclear disarmament. Why then, when it is discovered that a Soviet man is a believer, are attempts made to bar him from promotion? Soviets of People's Deputies which have no believers in them cannot in general represent our people. Ilya Nikolayevich Ulyanov was a deep believer. Several years ago when I was in Ulyanovsk, I was angered by the fact that someone had tactlessly obliterated, with paint, the Orthodox cross on his tomb. But the cross could be seen anyway. I think criminal responsibility for insulting believers should be higher. The main danger for our society are not those who believe in God, but those who don't believe in anything.

At present the Great Rehabilitation not only of names, but of ideals, too, is going on in our country. We've already achieved tremendous victories in glasnost, and we now have to turn glasnost into material values. While the people on whom medicines, food and other consumer goods depend are themselves not standing in queues along with everyone else, the heroic fight of our press against the tyranny of deficits will be senseless. And neither will deficits disappear while we have a deficit of confidence in non-Party people. People's self-government is impossible without confidence in non-Party people, because they constitute the greater part of the population.

Let the Party of Lenin know that the multimillion party of non-Party people is together with it in the struggle for

perestroyka. All the best people in our country-Party members and non-Party people alike-must be equal inside the party which unites all of us-that of Perestroika. Such a party does exist.

Sakhalin Officials' Malfeasance Concealed

PM2306092988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent Yu. Balakirev and SOVETSKIY SAKHALIN correspondents V. Guliy and V. Kulbakov: "The Barometer of Glasnost Is Pointing to 'Changeable': Reflections Following the Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk City Soviet Session"]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk—At the end of May and the beginning of June the development of events in Sakhalin was carried along on a high and powerful wave of people's activeness and their keen and passionate interest in the progress of restructuring in the oblast and in who is to represent the inhabitants of Sakhalin at the 19th all-union party conference. There is a link between these events and the application by P. Tretyakov, first secretary of the CPSU obkom, to retire on a pension.

A regular session of the Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk City Soviet was held 7 June. Vitally important problems pertaining to the Food Program and the provision of the island center with housing were discussed. The session opened on an unusual note. A. Danshin, chairman of the gorispolkom, proposed as many as four candidates for the post of first deputy chairman. When three of them were discounted for various reasons, the remaining candidate, Ye. Rybakov, chief of a bridge-building detachment, was asked to set forth his platform, to give his understanding of his new role. An unprecedentedly detailed draft of key provisions of a comprehensive program to resolve the city's housing problems was distributed among the session participants. This document gave a clear picture of the population of Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, the structure of its housing stock, the development of its construction base, and the specific parties engaged in the implementation of the program to provide every family with its own apartment by the year 2000. A draft general plan drawn up by specialists at the Leningrad State Urban Planning Institute was also discussed at the session.

The deputies discussed important projects and voted for good decisions. However, the session also generated a number of questions. It seemed that the deputies, getting carried away with bright prospects, forgot about the day-to-day problems, about the life that was seething outside the walls of the conference hall. And that despite the fact that it was this session that should have appraised everything that had caused turmoil in the oblast center of late. After all, the inhabitants of Sakhalin had not just discussed the elections of delegates to the 19th all-union party conference at rallies that had made news throughout the country. They had also discussed violations of social justice, they had cited specific cases, and demanded that measures be taken without delay. The party obkom and the oblispolkom had promised that such measures would be taken. However, the ispolkom had no intention of briefing the session participants on how these demands were being or would be implemented, and the deputies themselves did not get around to asking this question.

The root of many of the violations of social justice is to be sought in the work of the soviets. At the end of last year selective spot checks on the observance of housing legislation by local soviet ispolkoms were carried out on the initiative of the party obkom. The "catch" was so big for an oblast which is not densely populated that it embarrassed even the initiators of the checks. The inspectors came across the firmly established practice of including people with no entitlement on the waiting list for improved housing. Frequently the absence of a bathroom or the location of the apartment on an inconvenient floor were cited as reasons. At some point in the future such reasons will be considered valid. But not now when around 2,000 Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk inhabitants live in dilapidated houses and apartments that lack elementary amenties.

In the inspected rayons alone more than 400 apartments have been allocated over the past 2 years in contravention of regulations. They were doled out according to various criteria. Housing has become a kind of special currency used to resolve problems. For instance, if you have to speed up the elaboration of planning documentation, all you have to do is to allocate a couple of apartments to the planning office and you can forget your problems. Individual names of people who received special treatment in contravention of the regulations also came to the fore. V. Kovalev, director general of the "Sakhalinlesprom" Association, obtained a four-room apartment with the official approval of the obkom, passing on his former apartment (also a four-room one) to his sons. Judging by appearances, the director solved his own problems. Meanwhile, the department he heads was the only one in the oblast to cut housing construction. Yu. Shcherbin, the oblast's (former) chief health inspector, managed to obtain housing for his daughter on the basis of forged documents.

The list of examples could be continued. In the "Rules for the Registration of Citizens Requiring Better Housing Conditions and Allocation of Housing in Sakhalin Oblast," approved by the oblast soviet, we found nothing about preferential treatment of the personnel of the oblispolkom apparatus and its services. This did not stop N. Arsenyev, first deputy chairman of the oblispolkom, from issuing instructions to the gorispolkom about out-of-turn allocation of apartments to a number of his proteges. In the course of 1 year more than 500 square meters of well-appointed housing was allocated to the wrong people. That amounts to approximately 10 two-room apartments. It may not seem much. But it would have met the needs of almost half of the Great Patriotic War disabled soldiers currently on the waiting list. I. Kazakov, deputy chairman of the gorispolkom was

relieved of his post for crude violations of housing legislation. The party obkom bureau adopted a resolution on the results of the check-up which was entitled "On serious violations of the principle of social justice in the allocation of housing in the oblast's rayons." Quite a lot of time has passed between that session of the bureau and the city soviet session.

What progress has been achieved in the implementation of the obkom bureau resolution, what has the gorispolkom done in response to the results of the checkup? The session participants ought to have obtained exhaustive answers to these questions. After all, as everyone is aware, the housing problems were just the first step that led to the exposure of many other violations. So the lamentable state of the maternity hospital in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk came to light and the problems of the children's hospital which look scandalous against the backdrop of the luxuriously equipped polyclinic for the aktiv. People expressed their views also about the construction of the massive House of the Soviets which people, who have waited for decades to move out of dilapidated housing, find hard to accept. The deputies have every right to demand exhaustive information from the ispolkom on every such question.

In order to demand an answer, you must be familiar with the facts. These facts about Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk were compiled in a report for the party obkom. However, this report was not submitted at the sessions. It seems that it has disappeared altogether. Nonetheless, this report, according to S. Bakurskiy, a member of staff at the prosecutor's office who compiled it, was bulky in volume and very critical and alarming in content. Copies were made of this report. But none of them could be found either at the oblast People's Control Committee or even at the gorispolkom which, logically, should have a copy without fail. I. Bakhanov, chief of the party obkom's General Department, could find no such document in his office and advised us to address ourselves to the party organizational work department. V. Bogachev, deputy chief of the department referred us... back to Bakhanov. We questioned party obkom Secretaries A. Gordeyev and A. Kuzin about the report and they promised to investigate the matter. While we were waiting for an answer we called A. Danshin, chairman of the gorispolkom. His answer was that the report was at the obkom. So we called Kuzin and he advised us to ask... Danshin.

So where did the document which was supposed to help eradicate the exposed violations in the city get to? Why do the party and soviet officials who are supposed to adopt measures on the basis of this report not have it at hand and before their eyes?

While we racked our brains over these inevitable questions, another interesting detail came to light. It appears that in May a verification of the implentation of the party obkom resolution was carried out. The material, signed by the selfsame Bakurskiy and V. Ivantsov, deputy chief of the obkom party organizational work department, analyzed compliance with legislation in the allocation of housing to young specialists in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. However, deputies got to know nothing about this either. And, naturally, this report could not be found at the gorispolkom. At the obkom Invantsov refused to show it to us.

For three years now openness and glasnost have been proclaimed from the highest rostrums, yet shady activities still continue. Information, which people badly need, is protected, or rather hidden. Otherwise we would not have had to look so long for materials relating to violations in the allocation of housing in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk.

Let us add another detail. Appended to the aforementioned obkom bureau resolution is a report. No, not a report about Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, a generalized report for the oblast as a whole. A very modest report both as regards volume and the selection of facts. However, even this short list of violations is stamped "secret." And so the practice of the allocation of housing, which according to all present standards should be utterly open, ranks as a party secret in Sakhalin.

One of the speakers at the extraordinary party obkom plenum said as much:

Comrades, have no illusions. People see everything and understand it correctly...

The events of the past few days have shown not only that the inhabitants of Sakhalin understand everything, but also that they have no intention of putting up any longer with such methods of leadership.

Obkom, gorkom, and ispolkom offices are noticeably quieter now. For several days in succession groups of party, soviet, and economic officials were available for consultation by the population at the party gorkom for 12 hours per day. More than 500 inhabitants of Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk addressed themselves to them with their troubles and problems, most of them concerning housing. However, an analysis of these problems was not submitted for the session's consideration.

Menawhile, the population's interest in the current session is especially great. After all, the deputies were deciding the future of the city, the future conditions of life of every one of its inhabitants. The projects that were discussed were good. However, the road to their implementation leads through the accretions of past omissions. The main task today is not to hide these accretions from people, from their critical eyes, but to attend to them without delay.

Local Party Leaders Reprimanded for Censorship

PM2406081488 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Jun 88 p 2

[Own correspondent S. Kiselev report: "What Were the Editors Punished For?"]

[Text] In the city of Drogobych, Lvov Oblast, on the instructions of local party organs, an issue of the motorized crane plant's newspaper was "cut." Soon after, a similar episode occurred in the city of Tulchin in Vinnitsa Oblast.

However, they did not succeed in destroying the entire print run either in Drogobych or in Tulchin. Tens, even hundreds of copies were distributed from hand to hand, and the plant's workers were able to compare two almost identical "house newspapers," and the rayon's inhabitants two almost identical rayon papers.

"The only difference," V.V. Matsiv, editor of the plant newspaper PRAPOR PROGRESU ("Banner of Progress"), "is that one edition contained, in the article 'Labor Collective Council Reports,' two paragraphs criticizing the unscrupulous former deputy director of the enterprise, P.F. Martynov. In the other newspaper (with the same issue number and date and the same print run—1,000 copies), these two paragraphs were replaced by the slogan 'Long live may day!'"

Let us immediately name the Drogobych custodians of glasnost and democratization who sanctioned the newspaper's destruction: V.N. Shuvanov, secretary of the motorized crane plant party committee, and V.I. Dovgel, second secretary of Drogobych party gorkom.

And this is what happened with the Tulchinskiy Rayon newspaper, ZORYA KOMUNIZMU.

Its editor, A.V. Galiza, says: "We printed a critical item, 'Leisure Zone—Irresponsibility Zone,' about how soil from a recently closed cemetery, mixed with human bones and skulls, was used to reinforce the bank of a reservoir (which, apart from anything else, entailed the risk of causing epidemics). Following a decision adopted by V.S. Babiychuk, second secretary of Tulchinskiy party raykom, Ye.V. Folyushnyak, secretary, and I.Ye. Popov, chief of the organizational department, as well as Yu.P. Derkach, chairman of the rayispolkom, the print run of that issue—more than 16,500 copies—was confiscated from the mail delivery department and destroyed. In the new newspaper that was hastily put together, the critical report was replaced by a 'rosy' item entitled 'Friendship Through Song.'"

Now let us trace certain points in common between these two stories and sum up certain results. Thus, both newspapers were cut in the absence of the first secretaries, both because they published critical materials that, in the view of the local party leadership, were untimely. In Drogobych it was on the eve of May Day, in Tulchin—on the eve of a really historic event, the All-Union Seminar of Workers at Secondary Specialized Cultural Educational Establishments.

Only the secretary of the motorized crane plant party committee was called to account for what happened in Drogobych, and he was reprimanded, with an entry on his record, while in Tulchin the raykom second secretary, the secretary responsible for ideology, and the rayispolkom chairman were severely reprimanded, with entries on their records.

But the most interesting thing is that they also punished... the newspapermen. The editor of the Drogobych plant 'house newspaper' was given a party reprimand, while the editor of the Tulchinskiy Rayon newspaper was given a warning. For what? For failing to show a fully principled approach in rescuing the issues containing the critical items. Yet both editors defended glasnost with courage and principle.

One last thing. What if all the losses arising from the destruction of the issues and the printing of new ones (including the cost of paper, ink, the typesetters' labor, and so forth) were made good, down to the last kopek, by those who gave the orders and intimidated and threatened people?

Officials Discuss Restructuring on TV Programs

'Roads of Restructuring'

LD1706200288 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0510 GMT on 17 June broadcasts a 60-minute program as the third and final installment in its series on changes in the USSR since the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, entitled: "Roads of Restructuring (3): April." [For the first two installments, see the 23 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 47-52] The announcer states that the final installment will consider the question of who benefits and who suffers from restructuring. A number of people are interviewed, among whom is Vitaliy Korotich, chief editor of OGONEK. He says that restructuring is necessary in order to prevent the USSR from becoming an under-developed state.

Yuriy Krasnov, identified as the chairman of a Moscow Oblast agricultural cooperative, is shown being interviewed in the fields. Krasnov comments on opposition encountered by his cooperative: "It is very difficult for us because we do not encounter any direct and open attacks. No. Everyone agrees; everyone welcomes us with happy smiles. Well done! They slap us on the shoulder. But not only is there no real help but there is a passive... [Krasnov changes thought] Well, not just a fly in the ointment or what I would call a blow below the belt, but a quiet knife in the back."

Over shots of a deserted farm in Pskov Oblast, the announcer says: "How much has been said and written about these deserted fields and villages. People left these places which used to be successful. They invented reasons for this: lack of roads, lack of money, all sorts of mistakes. But only recently have they got down to the chief misfortune, to its human source: total collectivisation. It was precisely at that time that the peasant lost interest in his own labor. As a result he forgot what it was to bear responsibility for the land."

The video then shows pensioners being interviewed. They recall how collectivization was forced through by intimidation. Members of a lease-contracting team are then interviewed and describe the difficulties they are encountering: contract terms are frequently being altered for the worse; kolkhoz leaders want to take all the profits for themselves; limits on earnings are imposed.

The video shows scenes from cooperative markets in Leningrad and Moscow. Passers-by are heard voicing conflicting opinions about cooperatives, some saying they provide an invaluable service, others complaining about unearned income and speculation.

A report from Novgorod Oblast shows a building cooperative head and a local oblast ispolkom agreeing on the great benefits presented by this cooperative. Mark Massarskiy, chairman of the builders cooperative, says: "There are very many opponents. Recently a new procedure of taxation was adopted. It will operate in an oppressive way on the cooperative movement. I predict that the recruitment of cadres into the cooperative movement will decrease. I already know that many cooperatives are beginning to curtail their activities instead of expanding them. Why? Because people see this totally mad tax rate—90 percent on amounts over R1500—as making it not worthwhile." The oblast official agrees that large financial incentives are needed to bring builders to his remote and inhospitable area.

Krasnov explains opposition to cooperatives: "It is due to elementary human envy, ill-will, the desire to harm your neighbor, the habit of counting what someone else has in your pocket. These are the manifestations of the spiritual degradation which is the result, in my view, of our slavish principles which have been assiduously inculcated in us for at least two generations."

"[Announcer] For those who worked without stinting in the 1930's, who fought in the 1940's, this is difficult to accept. They do not consider themselves slaves, but enthusiasts, builders of socialism. They are right. It is difficult to wipe out much that they have lived through."

"[Pensioner N.I. Zhigachev, identified by caption] We are now exaggerating the question of repression and rehabilitations. They were political opponents who should not have been dealt with physically, of course. But millions of people? Do you know what millions of people mean and what the phrase represeed people means? Repressed people can be understood as those who were physically eliminated. That is one side. But if punishments were imposed... [Zhigachev changes thought] I mean the dekulakization, the kulaks, the mid-level peasants. I witnessed how collectivization was carried out, how dekulakization was carried out in the countryside. Well, if this is to be considered repression, then there were repressions, but that was the general approach to the kulak at that time."

"[Worker L.D. Shmeleva, identified by caption] There were no repressions where I was. We lived calmly and confidently. We believed in Stalin. He inspired trust in us. We experienced no cult, as we lived so poorly that we had only one radio to the whole block. We turned it on only when old ladies came to ask to listen to the Pyatnitskiy Choir. But we did not hear of any cult as such and never gave any thought as to whether there was a cult or not."

"[Student A.G. Trifonov, identified by caption] It is precisely the figure of Stalin who is now being accused of all the repressions and of everything, forgetting everything that he did for our country. Wherever there are victories and achievements, they are ascribed to the party and the people. Wherever there are shortcomings, Stalin was guilty."

"[Announcer] It is probably possible to understand any individual, especially if you hear or read the story of his life. However, it is impossible to forgive stubborn blindness, if a person continues to believe even after everything has been revealed and proved. If it is not just veterans who continue in their stubbornness, that means that there is a danger of a return to the past."

"[Shmeleva] My opinion of him has become even better. I do not believe that the executioner and Stalin are the same man. Not at all. That cannot be possible at all."

"[Trifonov] I am one of those who consider Stalin a really very great personality."

"[Zhigachev] Undoubtedly. And I do not condemn him."

"[Trifonov] In the first place, I would not primarily blame him. If any blame must be laid, I would lay the blame on everything: on our government and the whole people, not just on Stalin alone. In my opinion there are now very few people who have any ideals and who know why they live and to what purpose." [video shows the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article on 13 March 1988 entitled "I Cannot Forego my Principles" by Nina Andreyeva]

"[Korotich] People say to us: You are destroying socialism. But what sort of socialism? For God's sake, let us destroy that model of socialism which is based on lies. Here we need personalities who will stand up and show that socialism is able to give birth to these personalities."

The announcer notes that people expected immediate results from restructuring but these have not been forthcoming. In a report from the Elektrosila Plant, young workers say that although the media has been restructured, restructuring has not yet arrived at their level.

"[Unidentified workers] Is it to the ministry's advantage to restructure itself? Who has had the greatest privileges? Who lives in the brick houses in the best areas? The ministry officials. We workers live in prefabricated block buildings."

The workers go on to complain that there is still no incentive to work any harder, in spite of the promises of financial autonomy.

A worker from the Elektrosila Plant says that the functions of ministries should be reduced to deciding strategies; everything else should be left to the enterprise. Efforts are now being made to overcome the bureaucratic heritage of earlier years. The worker says: "In just a few months of last year and this year we have annulled somewhere around 2,000 directive documents, and there are still many thousands more."

A report from Kiev shows woodworking equipment rusting in a factory yard as a result of the imposition by the ministry of an unrealistic state order. Factories cannot dispute such orders. A state arbitration official explains the situation: "This state order from our [Ukrainian] ministry is issued on the basis of a demand which it receives from Moscow. But instead of proving to Moscow—I mean to the central ministry—that our ministry is unable to fulfill this order, our ministry passes on the state order to the enterprise, knowing full well that this enterprise is unable to fulfill the state order. It does not have the necessary shop. It is more convenient for the ministry to do that, because who will pay the fines? It is the enterprise which will have to pay; the Kiyevdrev Enterprise. The ministry will not bear any material responsibility."

The announcer says: "How are we to assess all of this nonsense? As bureaucratic idiocy or as an ideological stab? The main thing is: Who benefits from this? For it is precisely such facts which are cited by bureaucrats who repeat over and over: That is your restructuring for you."

A history teacher notes that recent Soviet history can now elicit different opinions and no longer needs to just repeat the official version.

A report from a ministry which is being forced to reduce the number of staff shows the distress caused to officials who cannot find another post and calls for this to be organized more humanely with retraining and job placement.

Passers-by on Moscow's Pushkinskaya Ploshchad call for restructuring to be speeded up and say that it needs to be defended.

An unidentified worker in a factory says: "I think that the one-party system—is a good one. I myself am a Communist and I am for the party all the way, but a monopoly on truth does not give good results. There should be a struggle, say, with the trade unions."

The video then cuts to an interview with a worker. [Worker Fomin at the Elektrosila Plant, identified by caption] "The course which we have now adopted is the only correct one and we must go along this course. But this does not mean that it is free of mistakes. It may contain temporary mistakes. Today something may be good, but we must not go along tomorrow with what was good today. There may be difficulties tomorrow and they must be sorted out quickly.

"Mikhail Sergeyevich sat in this room and we had a 2-hour conversation in 1985. We discussed all the reforms and everything. As he was about to go, he said: Of course there will be difficulties and mistakes, but we will not turn aside from this path. If we see that we are going the wrong way, we will stop to find out what we are doing wrong, cut out what is wrong, and go on. If we Communists have the spirit for this, if we do not applaud ourselves for having achieved everything and not needing anything more, then we will be victorious."

'Problems, Solutions' Program

LD1606084188 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 16 June carries a 90-minute program entitled "Restructuring: Problems and Solutions" which takes the form of a phone-in discussion program chaired by Lev Aleksandrovich Voznesenskiy. His guests in the studio are introduced as: Nikolay Andreyevich Zolotarev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department; Aleksey Mikhaylovich Ilin, first secretary of the Neftegorsk Raykom in Kuybyshev Oblast, a delegate to the 19th all-union party conference; Vladimir Borisovich Nosov, secretary of the party committee at the Motor Vehicle Works Imeni Likhacheva and delegate to the conference; and Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk Obkom and delegate to the conference.

Voznesenskiy introduces the program as follows: "Hello comrades. Today our broadcast is devoted to discussion of the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th all-union party conference. They were published by way of a platform for discussion on fundamental questions of restructuring. One such question, which is proposed for discussion now is the role of the party as a leading and organizing force in Soviet society; that which is new which is appearing in connection with this and which, obviously, should appear in its life and work in the stage of restructuring." Voznesenskiy tells listeners that, as usual, they have 20 telephones at their disposal under one number—217-45-13.

Voznesenskiy then continues: "And so the first question: It is asked by Yelena Sergeyevna Yevgrafova, a teacher from Leningrad: There exists a point of view on the need for a multiparty system as a main and sole condition for the democratization of our society. One would like to hear the views of the participants in the program on this question. Associated with this question is a question, also from Leningrad, put by Comrade (Levitas Izenemyamovich), a teacher: I propose the creation of a second Marxist-Leninist party composed of ardent supporters of restructuring, formally not members of the CPSU. If you please, Nikolay Andreyevich:"

Zolotarev: "I would start with the second question. We proceed from the fact that our party holds the political initiative and leads restructuring. It was the party which began restructuring and which continues to develop it profoundly in society, and when we talk about the creation of a parallel party of supporters of restructuring, then the question arises: For what aims? Our party calls them into its ranks, the ardent supporters of restructuring. It sets the task of rallying ardent supporters of restructuring around its policy. Therefore, the presence of a second Marxist-Leninist party, as proposed by Comrade (Levitas), would probably be unnecessary.

"The second question on a multiparty system is more complicated. It arose historically after October and, as is known, several political parties functioned in our country at that time, and were a part of the Government. This began under Lenin and subsequently became obsolete—I won't go in detail into the reasons—but it became obsolete even in that situation, in conditions of a multistructured economy and in conditions of complex social structures in society. In our time I believe that there are no social or ideological grounds in our (?society), on a socialist basis, for the existence of other parties, political parties. Nontheless, this question arises and I think that it is caused by one circumstance—both the dissatisfaction of the authors of such proposals and our common dissatisfaction over how the leading role of the party in our society was carried out for a long time.

"In this connection a question of principle arises: What is the further intent of our party in conditions of a one-party system, in conditions where it is the ruling party, as regards developing the democratic process in society and its own development on a democratic basis? A broad basis for this is opened up by the process which was begun in April 1985, which was continued by the 27th party congress, which opened up such possibilities which, since the time of Lenin, we did not have, and it is not a matter of one party or several parties. We know from our history that even under the long-term existence of one party, there were times when society lived democratically and there were times to the contrary, when everything was constrained and suppressed, and in the last 3 years we have been convinced that with the presence of one party—but with its firm resolve to steadfastly conduct a course of democratization—glasnost is developing, criticism is developing, and all processes are developing, and the involvement of people in management, and in the collective council of the party; and I think that the ideas expressed in the Central Committee Theses for the 19th party conference give a broad platform for discussion of specific paths to democratization.

"First and foremost I would like to note the principle significance of the theses on the division of the functions, on the demarcation of the functions of the party and the state. The question is so serious, it seems to me, that we cannot yet at this moment predict all the distant consequences and foresee them, because it is calculated on a new comprehension of the role of the party in society, from positions in which our party is a ruling and not a controlling party; that our party is an organizing and not a decreeing party; that the party is not power [vlast] but, I would say, the internal spring of social progress. These starting positions of principle, I think, give the key to correctly answering the question regarding a multiparty system."

Voznesenskiy continues: "What Nikolay Andreyevich has said is, of course, of most cardinal significance for the development of the process of democratization in the whole of society and, together with this, there should also, correspondingly, be substantial change in the functions of the party itself, and once the functions change it means that the structure of party committees and to a great extent the methods of their work should also change."

Voznesenskiy quotes from viewers' questions about the need to alter the structure of the party by reducing the size of the local party apparatus, depriving them of the right to interfere in economic affairs, and leaving them just an ideological and cultural-educational function. Ivashko quotes other messages from viewers on similar lines. Ivashko comments: "It is quite obvious that in recent years, or to be more precise in recent decades, the party has taken on many management functions and it is necessary to get rid of these. Nikolay Andreyevich has already touched upon this question and naturally they can be got rid of only by cardinally changing the structure of the party committees." Many management functions should be transferred to soviet, economic, and other bodies, but the local party committees are needed to implement party policy.

Ilin and Nosov comment on the importance of glasnost for the party. On the subject of glasnost, Voznesenskiy says: "The CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat have decided that before the end of this year virtually all members and candidate members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee plenums should be published." Zolotarev says: "There is much in this proposal which is sensible and we used to do this. Stenograms of the plenums were published in full. I think that we should return to this

question in our discussions before the conference and perhaps at the conference itself so as to, as the Theses say, remove excessive secrecy from party work."

A viewer suggests removing all bureaucrats from the party. Ivashko says that one should not confuse management with bureaucracy. Removing individual bureaucrats is not the answer; the answer lies in restructuring and democratization.

The participants agree on the need to eliminate parallelism in the various auditing and control bodies by having a single body. Ivashko says that this also applies to the economy where control bodies have regularly failed to spot corruption and malpractice.

A viewer complains that there are not enough women in top party positions. Zolotarev agrees but notes that women are now filling more executive posts in local party bodies.

Returning to the theme of a multiparty system and viewers' reaction to his earlier comments, Zolotarev says: "A whole series of comrades simply do not accept the possibility that democracy can develop while there is only one party. I would like to return to our experience, the experience of our party, to the period of Lenin. After Lenin, in the first years, before the 1930's, there was a free atmosphere and glasnost and the expression of opinions in the party and in society. The party did not obstruct but, on the contrary, itself generated ideas. The party accepted ideas from people. And the task which is now being posed, of restoring the Leninist aspect of our party, has this as its aim, and I do not see any obstacles to democratic processes being implemented under a one-party system.

"It is another matter that some comrades are raising the question that it is now difficult to enter the CPSU. But various 'greens' want to show what they are capable of, to enter the party, in order to fight for environmental protection. This way of putting the question is fully justified in some places, I think, because not everywhere are active supporters and champions of restructuring being allowed to become party members. And the question is rightly being raised that our labor collectives should join in this work and that the party organizations themselves should act more boldly, not putting their trust in the social origins of the various persons or groups of working people but giving priority to their participation in restructuring and in public activity."

Commenting on the question of a multiparty system, Ivashko says: "On what economic basis can another political party be created? We have the socialist method of production. Our revolution is called socialist. So what is in question here if there is another political party—the dismantling of socialism? I, for example, cannot agree with this. And I am not the only one. The party will not agree and the people will not agree."

Zolotarev goes on to quote from a viewer's question: "How can it be allowed that 19.5 million Communists should command 285 million Soviet citizens? This mistaken premise gives rise to such mistaken questions. What we are discussing here and what is to be raised at the conference is the question not only of renouncing the command method, which was unfortunately used in the past, but also of resolutely condemning it and resolutely moving over to political methods of leadership."

The participants discuss the question of what criteria should be used to assess the work of party organizations. In the past, plan fulfillment has been pivotal but there are now wider aspects.

Voznesenskiy points out that many viewers have raised the issue of "vozhdism", the greater leader syndrome or the notion of infallible leader, and have given examples of how this manifests itself from their point of view. He asks Aleksey Mikhaylovich Ilin to give his views on vozhdism, a new term put forward by comrades, he says, which could take the place of the term "personality cult."

Ilin: "Well, the views here are probably united in the memory of the misfortunes and grief that this personality cult brought about, and today it is indeed neccessary to do everything so that there should be no grounds for the revival of the personality cult, or so-called vozhdism. It is precisely for this reason that the party is setting in motion all instruments and mechanisms, glasnost, criticism, openness, and democratization of society, of leadership, and of management. Most likely one can look at this problem in this way."

Voznesenskiy notes that although the threat of a personality cult does not exist in present-day conditions, for various reasons, nonetheless, "we need to think not only about today, but also about tomorrow and after tomorrow and it is already obvious today that we need to create a mechanism which is based upon glasnost, on openness, on the execution, the efficient and strict execution of control and auditing functions, and so on and so forth. We have already talked about this, and in certain areas there should be some further elements in this mechanism. But already at this stage of restructuring, it seems to me, we need to create such a mechanism which will safeguard the party and society against the appearance of such personalities on its horizon, personalities who are associated in our country with the concept of personality cult or vozhdism."

Ivashko takes up the subject by noting that the proposal put forward for debate at the conference on the term of office for people in leading posts should make a certain contribution to this matter. He reckons that 10 years is quite enough, pointing out that something you can't get away from is the fact that over several years, a certain cadre milieu is formed around a person in a leadership post, a milieu which that person has created for himself, and so on, and this does not mean that the person in question is a bad one. It simply means that the person

needs to be given new work and new conditions with fresh horizons. Ivashko considers this to be a contribution to ensuring that the personality cult is not repeated.

Zolotarev says that this 10-year proposal would not in actual fact affect such a large number of cadres if you talked about first secretaries of raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms. In the main, he says, they are people whose work justified their employ, so that the establishment of a 10-year limit, as shown in practice, is justified. Ten years involving full exertion is enough to fulfill oneself as a leader.

Voznesenskiy points out that listeners' questions on the above matter also contained most varied solutions, showing that the subject is a very debateable one, and also real and worthy of very serious study and of the adoption of some kind of all-party and state decisions.

Zolotarev adds that one point that people are making in discussion is the fact that under a policy of serving 10 years, people would have no incentive to work hard during the second 5-year term. Ivashko retorts that there was the matter of one's reputation to consider, pointing out that after 10 years a person will still have to work; the end of 10 years doesn't mean an end to life. Zolotarev adds that after 10 years, such a person should be directed either into a parallel party body or into a higher body if that person merits it. He adds that there is always an incentive for such a person to work.

Ivashko points out that if a person has already stopped working, then in new conditions he might not be taken on in a new field, so he has something to worry about. Zolotarev adds that such a person wouldn't be kept on for 10 years. Ivashko reminds the group that they are talking about leading party workers starting from the level of raykoms. As far as primary party organizations are concerned, party shops, and so on, he doesn't think that such limitations need be introduced.

Voznesenskiy quotes viewers who call for attestations of party members and the expulsion of those who are below standard. Others call for a global purge of the party. The participants consider that veteran members and those engaged in production should not be included in such attestations, but there is support for the general idea of attestation.

Reviewing a selection of questions, Zolotarev says: "This particular question has been asked: Has Comrade Yeltsin been elected to the conference? Yes, he has been elected as a delegate to the conference from the Karelian Oblast party organization."

A viewer suggests that the Soviet anthem describing the party as Lenin's is incorrect as, in its present form, it is Stalin's. The participants say that the Leninist content is being fully restored now.

Viewers suggest more elections in local party bodies. The participants say that much progress has already been made in this sphere.

Ivashko discusses a number of questions about the recent elections to the party conference. He ponders: "Can I now say that everything was done as precisely as it could have been? No, I cannot say that. If we could go back 3 months we would do it differently." However, the aim of electing active supporters of restructuring was achieved, as there are now vast numbers of these. He goes on to describe a kolhoznik and other good workers who have been elected. Viewers have asked why certain individuals were not elected, but the principle of the elections is the important thing. The other participants concur with this. Voznesenskiy is just about to move on to another point when Zolotarev interrupts: "Excuse me, the question has been raised in Yaroslavl about indignation on the part of the Yaroslavl working people that Comrade (Lyashchenkov) was elected as a delegate. And a petition has been organized about his being a delegate; a sufficiently large petition for such people to be removed from the list of delegates. We did not ignore this warning and the Yaroslavl Obkom is now examining this question. Just as with any serious warning, it must be studied and conclusions must be reached."

Regarding the question of protecting people against persecution for criticism, Ivashko says that the local party organisation and the works collectives will be well aware of the situation and will be able to afford protection.

Many viewers express the view that all the privileges and benefits enjoyed by leaders of all ranks should be removed. Zolotarev says that people do not usually object to the open and legal material privileges but they do rightly object to abuse of position for their own benefit and for the benefit of relatives and friends. "As far as specific privileges are concerned, there are real ones and there are fantasies and rumors which go the rounds and which are invented and exaggerated." Ilin points out that the pay of local party workers is very low. Nosov cites examples of people taking a drop in pay to engage in party work. Ivashko says: "People's work must receive compensation, whether they work in a party organization, at a factory, or on a kolkhoz. In order to dispel these myths which exist about these special shops—I do not know if these exist anywhere, but I have lived a large part of my life in Kharkov and there was no such shop there, and I live in Dnepropetrovsk now." He goes on to say that having the use of a car is a professional necessity for many leaders who have to travel frequently.

Voznesenskiy calls on the participants to make their closing remarks. With reference to a viewer's complaint that active supporters of restructuring are having difficulty in joining the party, the participants note that one can promote restructuring without being a party member. Zolotarev agrees that some local party bodies are

being overcautious on membership issues. Ivashko says: "Instead of concluding remarks I would like to say this: Comrade Naumov from Moscow considers that my statement that I would not accept a party which was against socialism smacks of the time of stagnation. No, not of stagnation. The whole Theses document is permeated by one idea: to strengthen socialism, to restore its Leninist content, and not to dismantle it or fight against it. I think that on this platform and this basis, the party and the people will find the solution to all the problems now facing our society."

Zolotarev quotes a viewer: "Comrade (Dymnevo) expresses an interesting thought which I think is quite correct: The party should not lead, but persuade." He notes that the people support the Theses, but would like to see more guarantees against bureaucratism and any return to the past.

Voznesenskiy says: "Comrades, allow us to end today's discussion with that and to invite you on Saturday at 1100 Moscow time, when there will be a discussion of economic questions; and on Tuesday, when we shall be discussing questions of the state and law, ideology and culture. That broadcast will go out in the evening after the Vremya program."

Sklyarov, Others in Roundtable

LD2106092188 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1740 GMT on 20 June carries a 90-minute program entitled: "Restructuring: Problems and Solutions." The program is moderated by political observer Lev Aleksandrovich Voznesenskiy, who introduces the participants as: Yuriy Aleksandrovich Sklyarov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, chief of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and delegate to the 19th all-union party conference; Nail Khakimovich Kadyrmetov, secretary of the Tatar Obkom; Vladimir Konstantinovich Yegorov, deputy chief of the Culture Department of the CPSU Central Committee; Valeriy Vasilyevich Zhuravlev, doctor of historical sciences and deputy director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism attached to the CPSU Central Committee; and Academician Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, director of the Institute of the State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Voznesenskiy: "Among the speakers present here today it occurred to us to ask why each of us is a supporter of restructuring. That is what we asked each other, and we have decided to reply to this question publicly on today's program. Well, Yuriy Aleksandrovich, why?"

Sklyarov: "It would perhaps be more appropriate to reply here to the question, what is the basis of our confidence in restructuring and in the success of these enormous transformations that have been started in our country? It is not easy to reply because restructuring is a complex and unquestionably lengthy and contradictory process. Much remains for us to see and evaluate in the course of restructuring, much remains to do in order to affirm genuinely socialist relations in the economy, in the social sphere and in the intellectual sphere. But at the center of restructuring are people. The role of the human factor is particularly marked in the party's documents, and the influence of restructuring can perhaps be seen most graphically in the new ideological and moral atmosphere that has been created and is being created in our society, and which is typified by glasnost, a deepening of democratization, and a growth of responsibility among working people—responsibility for the state of affairs in their collective and in the state as a whole. In a word, the level of political and social activity of working people is being enhanced. And this inspires high hopes."

Voznesenskiy: "Nail Khakimovich."

Kadyrmetov: "I want to say that not to be a supporter of restructuring today means not to believe in our future. That is why there is no alternative to restructuring. I am a supporter of restructuring and it is a conscious choice."

Voznesenskiy: "Vladimir Konstantinovich."

Yegorov: "I'd like to associate myself with what the other speakers said. But I'd just like to single out one other point. I don't believe in restructuring at the level of slogans and appeals, be it from platforms or shouting in the street. I believe in a restructuring that is carried out with one's sleeves rolled up, as the phrase goes."

Voznesenskiy: "Valeriy Vasilyevich."

Zhuravlev: "You often see the following expression in the press. 'Luckily, forces have been found in our country which etc.' In all honesty, I don't believe in this concept of happenstance, of restructuring as fortunate happenstance. I believe in restructuring as a result of the logic of history, as historical inevitability and historical necessity. It has always been the case in our society and in our history that at the most difficult periods are an antidote to poisons was always found. And herein lies the great significance of the stimulus of the ideas of the October Revolution and the ideas of socialism."

Voznesenskiy: "Vladimir Nikolayevich."

Kudryavtsev: "To expand what you said a little bit more Valeriy Vasilyevich, I would say that restructuring embraces not just our country, but the entire socialist world. This, too, is no doubt a guarantee which inspires confidence in restructuring, with such a vast proportion of humanity taking a new road. Regarding the first part of your question—about my own viewpoint—all this is close to my heart because I share these views, and I would say that the collective that I represent has also always shared and today shares the line characterized by restructuring."

Voznesenskiy: "Now, I'll give my own viewpoint. I am a supporter of restructuring because restructuring, to my way of thinking, is the only way out of the historical impasse into which we were driven by our departure from the Leninist model of socialism, if you like. And historical necessity is something you can't argue with. All you can do is help it along."

Voznesenskiy reminds viewers that the party conference will open on 28 June. Sklyarov says viewers are interested in proposed coverage of the conference. "The conference will be widely covered by all the news media. Conference materials will naturally be published in the press, all our press, including the central and local press. The conference will be widely covered by the radio and television media, and I should like to say something about television in particular, since that is perhaps the most immediate medium, which will be communicating the sessions and proceedings to everyone. It is planned to transmit the opening of the conference on television—its first session, as well as the concluding session of the conference. These will be live relays, which will be broadcast from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. In addition, Central Television will regularly and quite widely be carrying programs of conference diaries—reportage from the sessions and broadcasts of speeches by conference delegates. In other words, there will be coverage of the entire businesslike discussion of questions raised at the conference for debate by our whole party—the question of the progress of the democratization of the party and society. Naturally, all this material will be given wide coverage in PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA and the other central newspapers, and, as I said earlier, in the regional press too."

Voznesenskiy cites viewers' questions about nonparty members and the conference. Sklyarov says: "As at previous party conferences, party members were elected as delegates to the 19th party conference. But this does not at all mean that restructuring and the discussion of the progress of restructuring and its first results are a matter for the party and Communists alone. In our country there is enormous interest in restructuring on the part of the entire Soviet people, and even now, during the discussion of the theses of the CPSU Central Committee, the mailbag not only of the CPSU Central Committee but also of the editorial offices of the central newspapers, radio, television and the local party committees contain an enormous number of letters, reactions, questions, wishes, and recommendations voiced by nonparty people. They are actively participating in the discussion of the theses locally. Open party meetings are being held. The theses are being discussed in labor collectives. In other words, there is a broad opportunity here for taking part in the discussion of this political document, this platform which the party is taking to its conference. And naturally the role of nonparty people is exceedingly great here."

Kudryavtsev quotes letters asking whether people in administrative positions are not a "class resisting restructuring." He says some are "bureaucrats," but others are "honest" managers, and the two have to be distinguished. It is not just a matter of people, Kudryavtsev says, of people being good or bad, or pro- or antirestructuring. You also have to look at the structure in which they are working and the mechanisms that need changing or scrapping. The two issues here are the political system, which is to be discussed at the conference, and the formation of the law-based state, i.e. measures to counter the administrative-command system.

Kudryavtsev says one of the elements of the administrative-command system in the "tens of thousands of instructions which, in essence, take the place of the law and operate outside, in circumvention of, or even against the law, and which are the tool of this system, the weapon of the bureaucrats that we are talking about, because the instructions are created by departments despite democratic forms. Neither the Supreme Soviet nor any people's forum discusses these instructions or drafts them." Kudryavtsev says that the Council of Ministers formed a commission in connection with the law on the state enterprise, to deal with cancelling obsolete instructions. It has worked for almost a year; "more than 10,000 documents have been cancelled, and I would say that the work is still not finished. And now, in connection with the passing of the Law on Cooperatives, literally yesterday a commission was formed, again by the Council of Ministers, chaired by a deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, to cancel obsolete instructions in the sphere of cooperatives. That's a fair bit of work, there will also be tens of thousands of documents in this."

Zhuravlev says he has a letter calling for the bureaucrats to be gotten rid of more quickly. He points out that Lenin himself advised the step by step approach; bureaucracy cannot be defeated by drastic methods, the fight must be based on democratic methods, and the transfer to self-management must be a gradual one.

Kudryavtsev says that bureaucracy can arise even in self-managing organizations, and glasnost must be used to combat it.

Yegorov picks up the theme, noting the many letters on the theme of bureaucracy in the cultural sphere. He cites the Union of Cinematographers as one of the creative unions where new forms of work are being tried.

Voznesenskiy asks Kadyrmetov a question on what is meant by the contradictions in restructuring. Kadyrmetov says: "The contradictions of restructuring are evidently contained, on the one hand, in the fact that the aims and goals of restructuring that have been declared and for which we are working today are not always, perhaps, supported locally. They do not meet with unanimity everywhere. Not in the sense that they are not supported, but in the sense that there is no support in the form of deeds, and that is what particularly disturbs us party workers on the spot, because the potential strength of many participants in, for example, the process of democratization, has still not been aroused. And if we

can manage to involve these people and make these people active participants in restructuring, then, probably, we can count on the success of restructuring. So that is the main contradiction of restructuring, which must be resolved without delay."

Voznesenskiy says that expansion of glasnost is a fundamental feature in expanding democracy, which itself is a counter to bureaucracy. He asks Sklyarov to reply to the questions he has on glasnost. Sklyarov quotes one letter asking why the author did not get a reply when he wrote to the television; this probably has more to do with failure of the way the television management deals with letters than with glasnost itself. Many letters have suggestions for improving the way glasnost is handled. "This theme is of exceptional importance, because one cannot talk about democratization, one cannot talk about the active involvement of the broadest masses of working people in active public, political, and economic life unless they are given all the necessary information, if the comrades are not to know how decisions are made, and why, by this or that administrative organ, and if they do not possess all the necessary information needed to decide for themselves about the steps being adopted and to make their contribution."

Sklyarov says that many interesting suggestions are published in PRAVDA today. It is suggested that party decisions and resolutions be issued as pamphlets, and that the press cover more local decisions. "The comrades suggest that the head of the Soviet Government should periodically speak on television, and also give information about what is being done in the national economy. They speak about a need to publish more material on the activities of the CPSU Central Committee and of lower-level party and soviet bodies, making use of the various opportunities. All of this is an expression of the genuinely growing interest of the working people in what the central party and soviet bodies are doing, and evidently this is indeed a most direct expression of support for the policy of glasnost that is being broadly implemented here at the moment."

Vosnesenskiy asks Sklyarov: What about the comrades who ignore criticism in the press? Criticism in the press is an important part of the democratization process, says Sklyarov. Party bodies are trying to be more demanding toward editors concerning publication of criticisms and replies to them, he adds. "But I think your concern about the fact that there do exist people who so far are not very sensitive to criticism in the press, and your comments are quite justified, and evidently much still needs to be done in order that criticism in the press always receives the proper response from all the bodies that it affects."

Kudryavtsev has a letter asking why there is not more glasnost in the law-enforcement bodies. In particular, it asks why the law-enforcement bodies in the country have not found a single bureaucrat to prosecute for persecuting people for criticism. Not many statistics yet exist concerning the law on persecution for criticism, says Kudryavtsev, but in general the author of the letter is right: "In the 6 months that has now passed, there have been 13 such cases across the country, just 13 cases in a big country for persecution for criticism, that is very few, and I think that the procuracy and the investigative bodies are not fully carrying out their duties in this. I also back him up as far as glasnost in the sphere of the law-enforcement bodies is concerned. I think this glasnost must be expanded. This is now starting to be done, true, fairly timidly, but glasnost in the courts should in general not be restricted at all. The press has started writing about the conditions in corrective labor establishments, and I think that this is right, this issue should also be covered. And in the work of the procuracy, although there are specific features in law-enforcement work, glasnost is indispensable in it. It will point up both the positive aspects, and the inadequacies in this work."

Kudryavtsev cites callers' letters asking why public opinion institutes like Gallup in the United States aren't set up in the USSR. He responds that such institutes have been set up, and cites the Center for the Study of Public Opinion run by Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya, and a similar center set up in the Institute of Sociology. He believes that such a center has been or is being set up in the Academy of Social Sciences attached to the CPSU Central Committee. Yegorov reminds the panel of a recent Central Committee decision on promoting sociological studies.

Voznesenskiy cites letters speaking of individuals being persecuted for criticisms and being unable to get satisfaction from those leaders whom they or their whole collective had criticized. Where can these comrades turn, the letters ask? Kudryavtsev suggests two avenues; firstly the Procuracy, which is obliged to deal with such matters—the procurator can't refuse to resolve them; secondly the court, which despite the law of 1 January on court appeals against officials, is still being underutilized. He recommends greater use of the courts.

Interrupting, Zhuravlev returns to one aspect of glasnost—namely, glasnost with regard to the past. He welcomes the need to know everything about the past, but describes this as only half of the problem. The other half is to understand the past. It is necessary to place both a knowledge and an understanding of the past at the service of restructuring.

Voznesenskiy says: "Well, since you yourself have touched upon this topic, please reply to the question from a number of comrades: Will Khrushchev's report on the personality cult at the 20th party congress be published? I have a whole bundle of such questions here."

Zhuravlev says: "Yes, yes, such questions do exist, and I too have already had such questions. A whole number of comrades ask about this."

Zhuravlev continues: "People of the older generation, of middle age, remember full well how immediately after the 20th party congress this report was read out in party organizations, and even in komsomol organizations. I was a komsomol member, but I listened to that report and remember that feeling of shock we experienced. And, in my view, this feeling of shock has endured up to the present day. And in this desire, so to speak, to return to this report, there is, it seems to me, for the older and middle-aged generations a great deal from that time. For some young people who don't know this, the report—its publication—is awaited, so to speak, like a discovery, like some kind of new sensation. Although most probably, at the present time, we now know dozens of times more about the personality cult and its manifetastation than Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev said about this in his day, speaking on this report.

"All the same, all the same, turning to his report, as to a source describing a specific stage in our understanding of the problem of the personality cult, has, of course a great significance. I can put it this way: If a decision is adopted on publication, and this is a prerogative of party bodies, then I think, in my view, the best thing would be to publish this report as a scientific publication of the stenographic record of the 20th congress, with the accompaniment of all the necessary comments that would allow us to understand the role of this document in the struggle against the personality cult.

"I can say that the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, for example, publishes stenographic records of this kind. It has published stenographic accounts of the 1st through the 13th congresses and the 15th congress of the party. At the moment we are preparing stenographic records of the 14th and 16th party congresses."

Voznesenskiy hands over to Nail Khakimovich Kadyrmetov who has received a great many calls on the need to solve the problems endured by the nationalities. The latter then proceeds to concede the many mistakes in this area in the past and that work has to be done to ensure that mother tongues do not suffer and that work to inculcate the spirit of internationalism must be continued. To illustrate his points he refers to the specific experiences in this area of his own Republic of Tatariya.

Kadyrmetov goes on to note that there will be approximately 50 classes where tuition will be conducted in the Tatar language, and this work will be continued methodically.

"I would also like to mention the following: We live surrounded by fraternal national republics—Bashkiriya, Chuvashiya, Mari, Urdmurtiya. For a long time our peoples have been living in friendship. But it has somehow happened that over recent decades a sort of invisible wall has grown up in relations between Bashkiriya and Tatariya. The peoples inhabiting our republics are not to blame for this. In fulfillment of the will of our peoples, so to speak, the obkoms last year adopted a decision to hold days of literature and arts of Tatariya in Bashkiriya, and next year of Bashkiriya in Tatariya. I should point out that the days of Tatar literature and art were highly successful in Bashkiriya; we saw how joyfully representatives of the neighboring republic were welcomed in fraternal Bashkiriya, and with what hospitality. I think this is only the start of a great deal of work on putting relations on a good footing, not only in the sphere of art, but also in the social and economic spheres: There are things we can learn from one another and take from one another."

Voznesenskiy introduces a question for Yuriy Aleksandrovich Sklyarov: "Are glasnost and censorship compatible?" Sklyarov reads out the question: "Comrade Dobrovskaya, Irina Konstantinovina, mentions that a meeting of the IZVESTIYA staff was broadcast from Leningrad, and in reply to a question about whether censorship exists, one of the newspaper staff answered bluntly: 'Yes, it does'. And the television viewer asks how censorship can be compatible with glasnost.

"A great deal has changed in the mass information media over recent years. If one is talking about censorship as a means of restricting glasnost and information in the press and the mass information media as a whole, I should point out that here there is perhaps little ground for complaint, and the statement referred to by Comrade Dobrovskaya by the member of the IZVESTIYA staff likewise lacks justification. As far as censorship is concerned, its task and responsibility is that of monitoring to ensure that state secrets are not published. And this alone is the task of Glavlit [Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press] and our Soviet censorship organs. I can, therefore, not agree with the IZVESTIYA staff member that the sort of censorship he is talking about exists.

"There is another matter, too, which also concerns glasnost. Why does glasnost in our country relate only to the past? And as soon as the present time is referred to, then right away it is individual shortcomings that are mentioned."

Comrade Perepelichnyy, from Kiev, is cited as expressing criticism in regard to the fact "that we do not yet speak with such decisiveness and acuteness about our shortcomings today, in restructuring issues, in our work today. This must evidently be raised not so much as a viewer's question but as a serious reproach against the mass information media and also party and local soviet staff for failing to sufficiently acutely analyze the results of their activities." Sklyarov reads a question from Comrade Altshuler, from Minsk, who suggests that the conference final documents should be adopted after preliminary discussion in the party, taking into account the opinion of the majority of Communists: that is, separating the conference into two stages, drawing up the final documents, discussion in the party, and then adoption. Sklyarov says that the nationwide discussion of the conference theses will ensure that the documents

adopted at the conference are both complete and thorough. Kadyrmetov adds here that over 16,000 suggestions were received from working people in the Tatar republic during the nationwide discussion of the theses, which is indicative of the widespread discussion. A special group has been set up in the obkom to analyze all comments, and all, no matter how hard-hitting, are submitted to the party Central Committee.

Voznesenskiy puts a viewer's question to Yegorov: "Vladimir Konstantinovich: is it possible to build restructuring without discipline? Why has drunkenness increased in factories? When will this will tackled? Comrade Nikolov from Ordzhonikidze asks. Yelena Semenovna Ivanova, from Kingisepp, asks: Glasnost and democracy should assume that everything is permitted; they should be based upon, and not violate, the articles of the Constitution. The Constitution clearly states that antinational propaganda is impermissible, and can be made criminally liable. Why then, are the antipopular, anti-Soviet actions of the Pamyat society, it says here, not nipped in the bud, allegedly on grounds of democracy and glasnost, even though they directly infringe on the Constitution, and their actions already are leading to crimes?"

Yegorov replies: "Well, I would like to say that with regard to informal associations, there are a very great number of questions relating to discipline, order, and how to make these compatible with glasnost and the democratic processes taking place in society. Even just enumerating the telephone calls and telegrams that have arrived would take up too much time. But one should point out first of all, evidently, that any association, any interest club, any movement or initiative can exist only if it does not contradict the constitution and existing legislation. This is the way that the activities of any informal association must be approached." Yegorov goes on to enumerate a number of youth initiatives in Penze and Vilnius engaged in organizing leisure activities. "When people really do have an interest in something, probably no frictions arise with the law, nor with the constitution, when it genuinely is for the well-being of the people and of our society as a whole."

Voznesenskiy asks Zhuravlev to reply to a viewer's question on whether there are "any ideological principles in modern social democracy that could currently be adopted in our country?" Zhuravlev replies that it is more a matter of seeking, in the spirit of the new thinking, mutually-acceptable solutions to the most important global problems of the modern time such as maintaining peace, eliminating nuclear weapons, deepening detente, and so on. He then goes on to another question; "Comrade Seryegin, Mikhail Mikhailovich, an officer from Moscow, writes: On 14 June PRAVDA published the party's discussion platform, Restructuring. I would like you to comment on the phrase expressed by Comrade Kuzmin, first deputy director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, that 'it would be particularly incorrect to apply the thesis on the existence of enemies of restructuring.' This is cited from the newspaper. In our party, unanimity has been established on the general tasks of restructuring, even though there is undoubtedly a diversity of opinions and points of view on the methods and speeds of achieving it. We are for a renewal of socialism, but against deviations from socialism, and against going back on the achievements attained."

Comrade Seryegin asks: "What do you understand by this? Well, it is hard to answer for Vsevolod Petrovich Kuzmin, but I was present at that discussion, and I understood these statements quite specifically. The fundamental spirit, the essence of our restructuring is expounded in these words, which the party expressed in the words 'more socialism'."

Zhuravlev goes on to cite the theses: "Discussions are fruitful only on the soil of socialism and in the name of socialism; they should not lead to political confrontation and separation of social forces. So Mikhail Mikhailovich is entering into discussion not only with the authors of this discussion platform, but also with the CPSU Central Committee theses, which, of course, he has every right to do. But there is a continuation: the next question. Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Zdravomyslov said, Mikhail Mikhailovich writes, that it is better to promise less, but carry out more. Then things will work toward enhancing the prestige of the party. Mikhail Mikhailovich cites this statement by Zdravomyslov, and comments as follows: In my opinion, this is precisely what the enemies of restructuring say. Well, this is put very forcibly, and not a single argument is put forward as proof of this forcible statement, so to speak. As far as I remember, Zdravomyslov's point was that he was coming out against running ahead of the tasks and goals set by the party, such as had occurred previously.

"You remember that in our history we have had such voluntaristic declarations, which were not backed up by life, and that caused damage to the party's authority. You recall the slogan 'We will catch up and overtake', you recall the famous principle, 'Today's generation of Soviet people will live under communism,' and in this context I understand Zdravomyslov's idea that we must not get ahead of ourselves in setting the goals, that we must be realists, and if we do more than we have said we would, then this will have its effect on the party's prestige. The last thing I would like to say, addressing Mikhail Mikhailovich, is that we must all fight the same fight for democratization of our public life by democratic methods. Otherwise we might reach the point of going from methods of seeking out enemies of restructuring to seeking out enemies of the people, so memorable to us from the black years of repression. And the main thing, the main thing that will show who of us is truly a defender and supporter of restructuring is, of course, not our words, but our deeds, and it is toward these deeds that the party orients us."

Voznesenskiy turns to Kudryavtsev, who has a lot of questions on points of law. Kudryavtsev deals briefly with several letters concerning the numbering of ballot

slips in such a way that the voter can be identified, the fact that bodies are still dealing with letters of complaint directed against themselves, a worker who has been illegally dismissed—which does not go into detail, and finally one concerning supervision of judges. Kudryavtsev says that in some countries judges are appointed for life so that undue influence cannot be exerted on them. Other things that need to be discussed are having the defense lawyer present during preliminary investigations and the use of jury trials. Kudryavtsev recalls that the criminal legal code is presently being reviewed.

Kudryavtsev: "By the way, there are also questions here about the death penalty. They say that it should be abolished, and in this connection the repressive apparatus created by Stalin should be dismantled, as Comrade Fedorenko from Moscow writes. I must say that this issue is being broadly discussed, and the lawyers... I for example am opposed to the death penalty, and I think that, in principle, it should be abolished. Although, to be honest, the majority of the population, as far as one can judge from the letters to radio programs, do not support this point of view. The approximate proportion of supporters and opponents of the death penalty is about eight to two. Eighty percent favor keeping the death penalty. That is a reflection of public opinion, which must also be taken in account, that's what I think. But this is a question that demands working through, evidently, and whatever the case, we should be talking about a considerable reduction in this measure of punishment, bringing it to a minimum, so that it becomes a rare instance, perhaps for the gravest of crimes."

Voznesenskiy asks Sklyarov to respond to the pile of questions in front of him. Many of them involve the role of the party, says Sklyarov, including one asking why the party conference is going to be discussing economic matters. Surely this is something for the Council of Ministers, not for the party? Sklyarov says that the party is the worker's vanguard not only in ideological and social matters, but also in domestic and foreign policy, and the economy is a most important part of domestic policy. Apart from this, the conference will be attended not just by party workers, but also by many people directly involved in running the economy. There are also questions about whether the party should be involved in cadre issues; some viewers can agree with the party helping educate cadres, but are not so happy with the way the party is involved in putting them in place. The party cannot help being involved in this, says Sklyarov, if it is to fulfill its leading role. The important thing is that cadres should be selected according to their business and political qualities, and that working people should be involved in a democratic process of appointing their managers. Asked about a great role for soviets in selection of cadres, Sklyarov agrees with the point in the theses on enhancing the role of the soviets.

Answering a question on the ideology of cultural policy under the policy of restructuring, Yegorov replies that cultural policy is based upon "democratic attitudes, respect for talent, a tolerant attitude to innovative quests and perhaps to anything unusual" and in general upon good relations with people. Yegorov admits that there was long a negligent attitude toward provision of facilities for cultural activities, but since April 1985 there has been wide cultural development. In the current 5-year period, funds spent on culture will be almost double those spent in the previous period. According to the results of 1987, not a single union republic reached the target for planned cultural spending. Yegorov also promises, in response to specific questions by viewers about restoration and maintenance of cultural monuments, that much more is being done. Assistance is being sought from enthusiasts in informal groups.

Summing up, Kadyrmetov says that he is still getting questions on problems relating to relations between the nationalities. "As far as I know," Kadyrmetov says, "issues relating to relations between the nationalities will be examined at the conference in the context of the entire problem of democratization of sociopolitical life. And it was not in vain that the Central Committee decided to examine this issue at a separate plenum. I am aware that preparatory work of this sort is currently under way in the party Central Committee, and in the local soviet organs, and in party and local soviet organs at the grass roots. One must have a very attentive and careful approach to national feelings, while not forgetting what we have achieved in questions relating to internationalism and relations between the nationalities during the 70 years of Soviet power."

Zhuravlev says that the main bunch of questions relates "to problems of a one-party or multiparty system. This problem has already been discussed, as far as I am aware. But there are a number of aspects here, and I shall try to give the briefest possible answer to these anything but simple questions." Viewers ask whether "abuses of party power, the cult of personality, and the manifestations of stagnation in the development of our society would have been possible under a two-party system. And there is another question: Are there any examples of a cult of personality under a two-party system? Well, one does not need to look far for examples. Let us take the PRC, for instance. In addition to the Chinese Communist Party there are about eight other parties. China went through the Mao Zedong personality cult. China also had all the economic excesses connected with the so-called great leap forward, and there were also mass repressions during the time of the so-called cultural revolution. So that if one asks about this, history knows of examples such at these.

"In connection with the question of a multiparty system under socialism, suggestions are often put forward, a whole heap of suggestions, for introducing another party. And it is even suggested that the question of introducing such a party should be raised at the party conference. Well, what can one say? There is a whole heap of such suggestions, and I did not come across the main thing in any of them: What should the political platform of such

a party be? In my view, it is from here that one should start. In the meantime, the CPSU has worked out a program of restructuring, and if I, for instance, know of any alternative to this program, then this alternative is an antirestructuring one. Therefore, when we speak of introducing a party, that is not the way it is done: They emerge and disappear according to a natural pattern in the history of the party. And above all, the question of a multiparty or a one-party system in our country is being resolved by the restructuring program itself, and by the way that the CPSU intends to resolve this problem, and how it does so. That is how it seems to me.

"The next question is one posed by Menushiy, Pavel Andreyevich: the criticism of Stalinism criticizes the general line of the party of the time, and the decisions of past congresses. How rightful and moral is it to reexamine the decisions of past congresses at subsequent congresses? Well, it is the living path of development of any living party to look at past decisions and to compare them with the tasks of the present day, and thus make certain corrections and, if necessary, reexamine and reject these decisions. As for historians, party historians for a very long time only commented on the decisions of past congresses; this led the science of party history into stagnation. The current creative study assumes an analysis of the decisions of previous party congresses and conferences, and of the way they were implemented. This alone can give science an instrumental knowledge of the past—study of the experiences of the party's activity—and allow lessons to be drawn from that past activity."

Zhuravlev goes on to give a brief reply to a question on forming social consciousness on the basis of a creative understanding of Marxism-Leninism: This can be done, he says, only on the basis of democratization of life.

Kudryavtsev sums up with a citation on the subject of the state being responsible to the people just as the people are responsible to the state. One viewer asks: "In returning the power to the soviets, is not the ruling party evading its historic responsibility to the people? Is it not leaving us all alone with the arbitrariness of officials?" Kudryavtsev cites the conference theses on the subject of the moral responsibility of the political system, which by no means contradicts the delimitation of functions.

Sklyarov says: "Viewers ask whether there will be a time limit for speakers at the party conference and whether a limit will be set by which time the conferences has to end. These matters will naturally be decided on the 1st day of the conference, at its first session, and as far as the time limit for the conference is concerned, it will depend on how the discussion of the main questions proceeds, and to what extent it will prove possible to cover a broad range of problems and really to create a serious basis for adopting deep and fundamental decisions. Such questions are as a rule determined by the conference or congress itself. What are the powers of the conference? Will the party's leading bodies come up for reelection, and is it true that the decisions of the party conference come into force after affirmation by the Central Committee?

"The conference is to discuss some of the most important questions related to the life of the country and the work of the party. It can make certain changes to the leading bodies of the party. This is what happened at previous party conferences. Concerning the question of Central Committee approval being given to the decisions of the party conference after it is over, this procedure was established in the past. In particular, at the 18th party conference, at the beginning of 1941, its decisions were affirmed by a plenum of the party's Central Committee. The party rules currently in force do not provide for this. Then there are a number of questions connected with individual aspects of our activity, including ideological activity. Will publication be continued in the future of material connected with Stalinism? I take this to mean criticism of the cult of personality and the crimes that were committed in the thirties and forties. Comrade Sharonov, who called in about this, appears to have certain fears. I believe that the proceedings of the conference themselves and all its materials will only confirm that the party strives to seriously and fundamentally settle accounts concerning the mistakes and shortcomings of the difficult past."

Sklyarov replies to questions about sports; about whether PRAVDA should be the organ not of the Central Committee but of the CPSU—Sklyarov's reply is a historical note on PRAVDA's status; and that new textbooks are in preparation. Sklyarov reads viewers' comments saying that "a brake has now been put on restructuring." One viewer asks: "When will all the talk end and real action start?" Another says: "In a recent program a writer said that apart from a powerful army, we have nothing, so we have nothing to defend." Sklyarov replies: "I think that we cannot support such a pessimistic tone." He quotes Gorbachev's 70th Great October Anniversary speech in which the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said that "in our hands today is the destiny of the great cause of the revolution."

Readers Criticize Response to Glasnost

PM2006105188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 14 Jun 88 p 1

[Article by G. Terekhova, Readers' Letters Desk editor: "The Week's Mailbag"]

[Excerpts] It felt conspicuously hot last week. Not only because the temperature here in Moscow at times reached the 30 degrees mark. There are only a few days left until the opening of the all-union party conference. Now the overwhelming majority of letters in the editorial mailbag are marked "Re: the Conference." These are the letters that require immediate priority handling: Some of them appear right away in the newspaper's

pages (you can see them in every issue of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA), while all specific suggestions and remarks on the Theses are carefully selected from the rest and sent on to the CPSU Central Committee. Thus, readers who do not see their letters in print should not worry: Everyone's voice will be heard without fail. [passage omitted]

One of the typical features of our readers' letters is the desire to weigh every fact—whether a trivial matter like in some of the letters or a major issue affecting all of us, the whole country—on the scales of morality. Hence the acute sense of social justice, the concern for not just personal advantage but primarily for the benefit to the fatherland, the awareness of the tremendous responsibility for the fate of the state which our generation has to bear, the desire to humanize human relations and restore to them kindness and respect for the unique human personality, the fierce rejection of lies and falsehoods, and the sharp reaction to the persisting "gaps" between words and deeds.

"Tell me," Engineer Yu.A. Kutuzov from Saratov, CPSU member since 1969, writes to us, "are you not amazed by the latest group awards of the country's highest orders to people from the administrative edict echelon? What is this? Is it a compensation for all the criticism against them carried by the press, radio, and television? Surely everyone is aware of this criticism? Or is it being ignored?" Muscovite V.V. Yalov, teacher at a children's music school, writes on the same topic: "Leadership officials should be rewarded not for their 'personal contribution' but for end results, in other words, for real achievements in the sectors they lead. Then these leaders' authority among the people will be boosted, and that is lacking today. As for their jubilee anniversaries, they ought to be commemorated more modestly, in the Leninist fashion."

Engineer Ye.G. Vasilchenko from Moscow read our newspaper's report that our cosmonauts are conducting observations of the Vulpecula Constellation from orbit. "I felt depressed," he writes: "Another first for us. What other country can afford such curiosity! And then, on 19 May, the newspaper published its 'roundtable' report on 'What Will Tomorrow's Outer Space Be Like?', in which a Soviet and a U.S. scientist discussed the prospects of a space flight to Mars. The discussion was certainly captivating. With a typical mercantilist attitude, the U.S. scientist turned to the question of money. Our scientist, 'for perfectly understandable reasons' as we say, did not touch the question of finance. This is why the 'roundtable' ought to be expanded and all who wish to express their opinion must be heard: Those who are waiting in line for housing because they live in less than 5 square meters per person, and those who spend their days in rooms with five or more persons in old people's housing. It would be quite interesting to hear the opinion of people from Chernobyl and of the guys who have returned from Afghanistan. Now that we have tightened our belts to the point where blood rushes to our heads and makes us think, when the ashes of pointlessly wasted millions of our compatriots and billions of rubles make our hearts pound, the most diverse opinions may come to the surface." [passage omitted]

We receive similar letters in our mailbag almost every day. But are these voices heard by those whom they address? What is their response? Do they heed these opinions in their activity? These questions are very important today if we do not want to bog restructuring down and drown it in a sea of words.

How are all these people, who are really thinking along state lines, to be involved in the solution of important social questions? How are we to utilize the gigantic human energy that has been awakened today? Unfortunately, our democratic institutions—as the mailbag shows—either still work in the old fashion or do not work at all.

Pensioner K. Volkova from Kharkov asks: "Why is the recently established Public Opinion Institute silent? Why is it that, on the eve of the party conference, the Institute is not polling the opinion of working people on the most important questions, not only in Moscow but also all over the country?" Eduard Vladimirovich Kuligin, worker at the Rostov Oblast Ethnographic Museum suggests that deputies' centers be set up in the cities. "Let deputies' commissions meet to examine current problems in conference halls where every citizen and voter can attend, express his opinion, and get involved in public affairs."

There are numerous suggestions for improving society's moral health and for its democratic renewal. For the time being, the supply is far in excess of demand. For the time being.

Sociologists Survey Restructuring Process

PM2206143188 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Jun 88 p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent V. Ovcharov: "Boosts and Brakes. Notes From the Field of Sociological Research"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "Much is now being written and said about the need for constant study of public opinion to better understand the processes taking place in the country. Are scientists doing anything in this area? M. Lobanov, Moscow."

"We have set ourselves the complex but important task of studying how restructuring is proceeding, according to the so-called principle of monitoring," Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Ivanov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research, whom we acquainted with the reader's question, reported. "It is a question precisely of keeping constant track of public opinion. What I mean by this is not

sociological 'photographing' but getting to the essence of the processes taking place in the course of restructuring and understanding its dynamic nature."

The regular gathering and analysis of sociological information on restructuring, the scientist continued, and its profound interpretation from the positions of the concept of the revolutionary renewal of society adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress are creating good preconditions for overcoming speculativeness and dogmatism on the one hand and various kinds of groundless, harebrained schemes and attempts to engage in wishful thinking, on the other. It is our duty to remain on territory of real facts, however bitter and undesirable they may sometimes be. For too long social scientists engaged in commentating, justifying the status quo, and compiling logical constructions very far removed from life and its real needs.

Scientific boldness and innovation in studying Soviet society are now more necessary then ever, for a decisive stage of the struggle for the success of restructuring has begun. It is perfectly understandable that the fullest knowledge of this stage is needed.

A feature of the methods of the new approach is that it relies on an all-union industrial sample embracing 120 of the country's largest enterprises. Sociological monitoring relating to problems of restructuring was begun in 1987. Then 11,410 people were polled. In the 1988 investigation 11,181 people—workers, engineering and technical personnel, employees, and leaders of various ranks—were polled.

Let us examine some results obtained this year, compared with last year.

The first question put to those polled was this: "What is your personal viewpoint with regard to the need for the restructuring taking place in the country?" The following replies were obtained (in percentages of the numbers polled):

"It is an extremely necessary measure prompted by the objective state of affairs"—86.4 percent (1987) and 80.6 percent (1988).

"It is a useful, although objectively not so necessary, measure"—7.8 and 10.1 percent.

"I see no special need for restructuring"—1.4 and 3.5 percent.

"I have not thought about this and find it hard to answer"—1.9 and 3.4 percent.

"Other"—1.1 and 2.4 percent.

How is it possible to account for the data obtained? Particularly the increase in the proportion of those who see no need for restructuring? It can most likely be assumed that our consciousness is being freed from unsubstantiated hopes of quick successes in restructuring, that a more realistic approach to the business and aims of restructuring is being asserted, and that its problems and difficulties are becoming understood.

This question was included among the others: "What shortcomings do you see at the present stage of restructuring?" The replies were split as follows:

"Conditions have not been created to impose restructuring, and talk of restructuring is supplanting real restructuring"—68.1 and 73.1 percent.

"The essence of restructuring is being distorted locally, and it is being diverted from the main strategic areas"—25.1 and 33.6 percent.

"The policy of restructuring is deliberately being discredited"—3.9 and 4.5 percent.

"Other"—2.9 and 8.2 percent.

The increased number of replies pointing to attempts to substitute talk of restructuring for the cause of restructuring, compared with 1987, is noteworthy. Such a danger obviously exists. But it is also possible that this is simply a reaction to propaganda of restructuring and a manifestation of a kind of "tired perception" of information about restructuring which is monotonous in purport and form.

Among the shortcomings manifested at the present stage of restructuring the distortion of its essence, a departure from its strategy, and even its discrediting are cited more frequently than before. The reluctance of a certain section of cadres to carry out restructuring in accordance with its true aims and tasks is obviously telling.

It is natural that the new system of labor remuneration cannot fail to influence the course of restructuring. The following question was asked in this connection: "How do you assess the efficacy of the measures to improve labor remuneration and their influence on enhancing working people's interest in the end results?" These replies were obtained:

"These measures are very effective"—9.8 and 15.0 percent.

"Their efficacy is negligible"—17.2 and 29.6 percent.

"I sense no changes in the system of labor remuneration"—61.1 and 31.5 percent.

"The changes have been for the worse"—2.5 and 13.9 percent.

As we see, there has been an increase in the numbers who consider the new system of labor remuneration effective or negligibly effective. There has been an increase in

those who have experienced this system in action but, at the same time, have felt no positive emotions, that is, restructuring has already "stung" a certain section of working people and elicited negative assessments from them. That is perfectly natural.

It is obvious that labor productivity growth and the practical realization of the planned levels are a very important indicator of the effectiveness of restructuring. Therefore this question was asked in the course of monitoring: "Are you confident that labor productivity can be increased 5-6 percent annually over the next few years?" The replies:

"Yes, I am confident"—18.9 and 11 percent.

"This is possible if we succeed in overcoming inertia and implementing the planned measures"—62.7 and 67.3 percent.

"I doubt that the set task is realistic"—11.5 and 19.5 percent.

"I find it hard to answer"—2.6 and 2.1 percent.

There has been a fall in the number who are definitely confident that such a level of labor productivity can be secured in the next few years, but an increase in the number who believe that it can under certain conditions. This is a more realistic approach founded on experience.

Assessments of the changes taking place in the economic and social spheres are important for characterizing restructuring. These replies were received to the question "How would you assess the results of work on restructuring over the past year in the economic sphere in the country as a whole?":

"Considerable successes have been achieved"—2.7 percent.

"Certain successes have been achieved"—42.5 percent.

"Virtually nothing has been achieved"—34.6 percent.

"The situation has even become worse"—8.8 percent.

"I find it hard to answer"—11.4 percent.

Those polled assessed results in the sphere of social policy as follows:

"Considerable successes have been achieved"—4.7 percent.

"Certain successes have been achieved"—51.6 percent.

"Virtually nothing has been achieved"—31.7 percent.

"The situation has even become worse"—3.6 percent.

"I find it hard to answer"—8.3 percent.

Thus, those polled point to changes for the better (considerable and slight) in both the economic and the social sphere. Obviously, the conclusion may be drawn that no less than half the people working in industry see the creative potential of restructuring and its real achievements, although the proportion who see no change remains very weighty (slightly over one-third), and some believe that there has even been a deterioration (8.8. percent in the economy, and 3.6 percent in the social sphere).

These assessments reflect the real contradictions at the present, transitional stage of restructuring. It is clear that it has not yielded positive results everywhere. But movement has occurred, and hence the predominant positive assessments.

As is known, the democratization of management and the real involvement of all members of a collective in its affairs are of special significance in implementing restructuring. Of great interest in this connection are the replies to this question: "How would you assess the efficiency of the activity of organs of collective self-management (councils of labor collectives, shop, teams)?"

"They work very vigorously"—2.7 percent of those polled.

"They have not yet manifested themselves fully"—52.8 percent.

"Elected councils are inactive"—18.3 percent.

"We have no organs of collective self-management"—11.1 percent.

"I cannot say, since I have no information about this"—15.3 percent.

I would say, the scientist pointed out, that most people are playing a waiting game. And this is understandable, as it is not long since the Law on the State Enterprise (Association), which is geared to the development of self-management principles in labor collectives, came into force.

As is known, restructuring began "from above." But only universal support can bring it success. Only by becoming the cause of the whole people can it be implemented. Today there is every reason to claim that restructuring has drawn millions of Soviet working people into its orbit. They participate in it, but, of course, with varying degrees of activeness, interest, and return.

The growth of the masses' initiative, creativity, and activeness is probably a generalizing indicator of their participation in restructuring. Those polled were asked a

direct question: "Have you noticed in your collective any increase in the activeness, initiative, and interest of the working people in the enterprise's affairs?" The replies:

"Yes, a very substantial increase"—3.2 percent of those polled.

"Yes, activeness has increased to a certain extent"—46.2 percent.

"No, hardly any increase"—41.7 percent.

"I find it hard to answer"—7.4 percent.

There have been certain changes for the better here too, although very restrained assessments of these changes predominate. Great reserves exist and, by all accounts, there is a large number of collectives where people's activeness and interest in restructuring have not yet increased.

It may be said, on the whole, that "Monitoring-88" makes it possible to see the overall picture of restructuring in industry through the assessments and opinions of those directly involved in this process.

The information obtained is undoubtedly topical and important both for organs of management and for the public. It is also important as information for the history of restructuring, for it makes it possible to see the dynamic nature of the changes that are taking place and to see the movement away from the "starting points" of the 1987 indicators. In time the value of this information will increase still further.

Ligachev Visits Construction Materials Combine

LD2306192188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today visited the Moscow Main Administration for Construction Materials Butovo Combine. He learned of the work of the combine, where in the current year the whole collective has gone over to lease contracting, and of the organization of work and production in the new conditions. By leasing from the state the basic assets, developing financial autonomy, self-management, and self-financing, the collective has increased output and labor productivity since the start of the year by one-third. From beginning as a loss-making enterprise it has become profit-making.

A conversation took place with workers, engineers, technicians and members of the council of the workers' collective. Comrade Ligachev spoke of the progress of preparations for the 19th all-union party conference, the work of the CPSU Central Committee for strengthening the economy of the country and solving social tasks, and the party's foreign policy activity.

It was emphasized that the fate of restructuring depends on selfless work at every workplace and in every workers' collective. In this respect the work of the combine merits high approval. The workers expressed full support for the line of the CPSU Central Committee on implementing restructuring.

Talyzin Chairs Conference on Youth Labor Squads

PM2406091788 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 88 p 2

[Own correspondent report: "Problems of Student Summer"]

[Text] A conference took place in the USSR Council of Ministers that examined questions of preparing for the third labor semester. This summer, construction detachments alone have planned to fulfill work to a value totalling R660 million.

But the results of the contract campaign have shown that economic organizations have already turned down 747 detachments numbering almost 23,000 persons. Subdivisions of the USSR Gosagroprom, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the USSR Ministry of Construction in the Northern and Western Regions of the USSR, and the USSR Ministry of Health accounted for the greatest number of refusals. The USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry and the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification still owe students more than R150,000. These resources should have gone to organizing the training and work of student detachments. Is this the reason that the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification occupies one of the top positions in accidents involving students?

Senior officials of the USSR Council of Ministers, the CPSU Central Committee, and the Komsomol Central Committee, and of ministries and departments took part in the conference. N.V. Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chaired the session.

The necessity was stressed at the conference for all ministries and departments to carefully check once more the readiness of their economic organizations to receive student detachments.

Economic

Abalkin Comments on Party Conference Theses

LD2406045588 Moscow TASS in English 0403 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—"In the course of economic transformations that have been implemented in the Soviet Union since 1985, it has been possible to arrest the accumulation of negative tendencies that threatened to develop into a crisis situation," a TASS correspondent was told by director of the Institute of

Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician Leonid Abalkin. The scientist who is a delegate to the 19th all-union party conference which opens next Tuesday shared his thoughts in connection with the discussion all over the country of the theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the party forum.

The academician went along with the appraisal of economic transformations, contained in the theses. True, he said, it should perhaps be added that they have been successful in the main. "For the situation in the country is now rather complex: We have yet been unable to alter negative tendencies in many directions."

In Abalkin's opinion, the underlying causes of this are that it is attempted to change the situation mostly by decision-making. "Documents pile up. But it should be realized clearly that the scope, depth and consequences of perestroyka are measured not by the flow of documents, but by the real change in basic economic relations. Meanwhile it is only some six months ago that real steps were started."

The scientists noted that, in his opinion, some decisions are indeterminate and inconsistent. Regrettably, "many of them are still taken in camera, in the atmosphere of secrecy, without taking into consideration proposals, also from researchers from the academy of sciences," he said. "There is yet no guarantee that further decisions aimed, for instance, at remedying the situation as regards state plans, state orders, norms, will be taken in accordance with the spirit and nature of perestroyka."

Another problem, the delegate to the conference said, is that scientists "are obliged to find in the framework of the one-party Soviet system a mode and mechanism for expressing alternative proposals and different approaches to the solution of problems. It is necessary to find an opportunity to compare different approaches, to choose some or other versions."

The existence of alternative proposals, Abalkin said, is not the expression of various political platforms or opposition trends, but a normal process reflecting the dependencies of social development. The political leadership must have an opportunity to make choice. Otherwise it will never get rid of the power of the apparatus, and will only be making partial amendments to the variants offered.

"I think it is also important to find a niche for members of the Academy of Sciences in working out alternative decisions and playing the role of opponents to state organisations on major managerial, social and economic tasks, fulfilling functions of experts in these matters."

Academy Official on Status of Economic Reform

PM2706114788 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 25, 18-24 Jun (Signed to Press 16 Jun 88) pp 1, 2

[Interview with P.G. Bunich, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Council on Economic Accountability and Self-Financing Problems, by correspondent N. Zhelnorova: "Why Is the Reform 'Not Working'?"—first paragraph is ARGUMENTY I FAKTY introduction]

[Text] Some 18 months ago ARGUMENTY I FAKTY published a conversation with USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member P.G. Bunich on radical economic reform. Quite enough time has elapsed for the first results. Our correspondent N. Zhelnorova talks again with P.G. Bunich, who is chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Council on Economic Accountability and Self-Financing Problems.

Zhelnorova: Pavel Grigoryevich, economists have elaborated a new type of economic mechanism that is convincing in its depth and promise. But all that is on paper. In real life the reform is doing little at the moment...

Bunich: Yes, in practice the situation is worse than expected. The main reason is that they have been half-measures.

A very modest document was created on the state sector. It was and still is a half-measure. Hardly any self-financing, self-planning, and self-management at all. I suppose the Law on Cooperatives is an example. No one is being forced to join a cooperative, but many people are joining; no one is forced to work well in a cooperative, but everyone does work hard, because it is the only way. The Law on Cooperatives has shown what is needed today, what everyone is short of. A law on the genuine democratization of production, on the abolition of red tape, and on clearing away the red tape that surrounds ownership. Hitherto we have dressed state ownership in monstrous garb. It is time to replace it with something appropriate.

If the Law on the Enterprise is radical, both directors and workers will need no encouragement to get to grips with it. Then the state sector will awake from its slumber and will not only develop well itself but will also be able to compete with a strong cooperative sector. Bear in mind that at the moment 200,000 people are working in new cooperatives, soon there will be 1 million, and then... So who is going to work at the metallurgical plant? But when we realize, it may already be too late: The flywheel will have slowed right down and started to rust. Isn't it better to put the state and cooperative sectors in equal starting positions? Why did the New Economic Policy work right away? Because it was bold and in earnest. It was for that reason that the reform "worked" in China.

Zhelnorova: You believe that the reforms must be even bolder... But who is going to take the political risk, particularly when the present reforms are being quietly sabotaged?

Bunich: Only the party and the Central Committee can do this. They must not only proclaim bold political slogans but also take the risk and take responsibility for the mechanism through which they are implemented. Some bold person must now take the risk of carrying out for the state sector the same kind of radical reform as in the cooperative sector, and things will then be easier, particularly with economic accountability.

Zhelnorova: What forces exactly are hindering the economic reform? Names as well, preferably.

Bunich: It would be tantamount to giving millions of names. The central economic bodies and Gosplan are the principal inhibitor. As soon as they get Central Committee political documents they stuff them with something entirely different. Now the method of destroying the reform is not to say no, but to say yes. The opponents have quickly learned to change their stripes.

Zhelnorova: But there must be a gratifying factor at the present stage, something to give us hope of a favorable outcome for restructuring?

Bunich: Ideology is very gratifying in that it is becoming richer with each passing day. A political awakening is taking place and people are beginning to thaw out. But without economic accountability this thaw makes people fearless and their work... deteriorates. Among a considerable proportion of the working class discipline has now deteriorated, as has the attitude toward authority. Now people fear nothing. But they ought to be afraid. Not of authority, but of economic accountability, under which able workers will do well, but lazy ones will have a bad time.

Zhelnorova: We are talking a lot about cutting ministries, but they "neither burn in fire nor drown in water," that is, they have a strong tendency to resurrect themselves. Is there a solution?

Bunich: There is one solution: The ministries must be eliminated, not cut. When an enterprise makes its own plan, finances itself, and elects its own director, it does not need ministries then.

[illegible] the state has to have a "shadow," parallel plan for [illegible]

[illegible]norova: Why the duplication?

Bunich: By comparing the amount of the first plans, from the enterprises, with one's own control plan, one can see the "gaps," where the interests of the enterprises and of the state did not coincide. So a state order has to be issued for it, but it must be voluntary—as in the cooperative sector. Voluntary—therefore, economically advantageous. Otherwise no one would take it. We used to say that we had to make fewer indicators that would be passed down from on high, forgetting that even one indicator can become a millstone for the whole enterprise.

As a result Gosplan will need strong sector departments. At the moment major sector departments exist both at Gosplan and at the Council of Ministers, and the ministries are wholly sectoral. Not to mention the Central Committee. The new Gosplan sector departments would ascertain where state interests are not being observed and would use economic methods to alter the situation.

Zhelnorova: Foreign trade is the litmus paper identifying changes in our economy. But here too, despite a number of clever documents, there have been no marked changes. Why?

Bunich: On paper the foreign trade reform was perhaps the most revolutionary. What it did was give industrial enterprises in certain sectors the right to trade abroad independently. And more than 80 enterprises are already taking advantage of it. One should not be afraid to give this right to everyone. After all, those who are unable to compete will not be able to sell their goods and services on the international market. But a small plant could make something unique for the foreign market and be more successful than a gigantic enterprise that no one needs.

The arrangement was very simple: The enterprise sells its products on the foreign market at a contract price, then the income—to achieve a unified financial result—is converted into rubles and added to income on the domestic market. A figure for overall earnings is obtained. Costs are deducted and what remains is profit.

But the stumbling block is the question at what rate dollars are to be converted into rubles. What they did was the following: Prices on the international market produced their own domestic wholesale prices. For example, an item is sold for 200 dollars and a similar article here costs R100, so the enterprise should be considered to be earning R100 per item.

At the moment we have 3,000 rates! They are called differentiated currency rates. The essential purpose of each of these rates is to adapt foreign earnings to domestic prices! And this trifle ruins the whole idea of reform.

Zhelnorova: The Law on the State Enterprise talked of bankruptcy, and it put many people in a state of shock. But there was no need to be alarmed. No one has gone bankrupt so far, despite the proportion of loss-making enterprises. Is it that they first put the fear of God in people and then became frightened themselves?

Bunich: Should we allow these bankruptcies? If there is no other way, we should. But first of all it is necessary to develop insurance against commercial risk. We do not have it. Cooperatives have been authorized to set up insurance companies, but the state sector has been driven into a corner. Why does it not have the right to set up an insurance company? Why are new types of insurance not being introduced? In fact, the main purpose of insurance in the future will be to enable enterprises to take risks. Otherwise there will be no progress. And if an enterprise has gone bust it will not be bankrupt immediately if it has insurance. But if it has gone bust and the insurance does not cover it, it is then completely bankrupt. And there is no alternative but to liquidate them.

Zhelnorova: Another notorious concept is competition, which is like a red rag to a bull as far as many people are concerned—like a departure from socialism. Some people obstinately believe that it is better to be poor and have a quiet life without all those capitalist "acceptance officials."

Bunich: They are not capitalist, but economic "acceptance officials." There are two forces behind worker commitment: One is internal—economic accountability (people want to earn good money); the other is external—competition. In fact, it is clear even from the socialist countries' experience that the second is stronger. The will to "survive" is stronger than the will to "live well." Competition is a powerful force.

Zhelnorova: To be able to conduct the reform competently it is necessary to handle money and credit intelligently. Instead of two banks there are now six. People were relying on their "flexibility." But it is just like in the Krylov tale: "No matter how you arrange yourselves, my friends"...

Bunich: Of all the reforms, the biggest "nonreform" is the credit reform. Hardly any changes at all. If the bank was closed today, hardly anyone would notice. Because the budget takes all the money surplus to the plan and makes up for any plan shortfall. Why credit, then? For above-plan measures, perhaps. The bank must become an essential intermediary in the production process. The new bank will be in every enterprise's plan. Then it will be necessary to get the money together, giving a higher deposit interest, that is, interest on enterprises' deposits in banks. At the moment the interest is microscopic. And not on all money, but on a part of it.

The bank must be a "grabbing" instrument in a rich enterprise's plan and an "economically accountable dispensing one" in a poor enterprise's plan. The bank has to think who it is going to dispense to. It will take more from a bad enterprise—because of the loan risk. The main thing is that the banks should set their own interest rates. If, for example, money is not coming in, they will increase the deposit rate; if no one wants money from them, they will reduce loan interest.

Commercial credit—between enterprises—is needed. It is not prohibited by the Law on the Enterprise, which means it is permitted. But the bank is continuing to elaborate instructions on commercial credit, fearing that there may be less bank credit because of it. Is it a great blessing to have bank credit that has credited the whole country to such an extent that we are now rolling in credit, not in goods?

If enterprises are making do with one another they will not go to the bank. They don't need to. In my view, you have to go to the bank when there is no other solution.

The second objection to commercial credit is that there would be no bank control. But we know a better control than bank control—customer control. If an enterprise gives money to another enterprise it will be better than any banker at making sure it is returned. The third objection is that there will be more funds available. How come more? It leaves one and goes to another. The funds are eactly the same. I believe the banks are getting above themselves, wanting a monopoly on credit.

Zhelnorova: To what extent is it possible and expedient to use shares in our country?

Bunich: There are several enterprises selling shares. But at the moment only to their working people. They figure they cannot sell to others because they would get a better rate of interest. So why does the savings bank take money from any investor, not just from the people living in the area? According to the Law on the Cooperative System a share has only a nominal value. But it then either rises or falls. Why shouldn't it have a real value? And why not provide for share sales? If they cannot be sold who will buy them? This brings up the question of a securities market. We have only said the word "share"; we have not yet switched on the mechanism that ensures its circulation.

Zhelnorova: Since there is no strict accounting and order in our money supply, don't you get a situation where those who have a great deal of capital to begin with (acquired illegally, perhaps), having invested in a highly profitable enterprise, will have a big income? The rich, who are having it so good, will have it even better. But what about the poor? You will say they must work better. But no matter how hard you work you can't keep up with the thieves and swindlers. So even if current and future conditions are fair, the unfair starting conditions will still lead (cumulatively, what is more) to an unfair result. Should this be encouraged?

Bunich: The use of shares cannot be kept in check because of thieves and swindlers. The assistance from shares is threefold: In the first place, they reduce the amount of money chasing consumer goods. Second, they lead to an increase in the production of goods. Third, they increase shareholders' interest in enterprises where they have invested money.

As for the thieves and swindlers, whether or not they have shares is not the principal, essential question, but a secondary one. Essentially one has to eliminate the thieves themselves, not the thieves' shares. Real economic accountability will facilitate this. Without it the thieves are stealing from the state; with economic accountability they are stealing from the collective. What a difference! The whole "world" will be against the thieves. The same cannot be said of those who used to be thieves but are now going to live with shares. They didn't get caught because they weren't under suspicion.

Zhelnorova: Do you not consider monetary reform essential? What are the current objections to it?

Bunich: I do not see any need for it. Among the 178.4 million investors there are millionaires. But the well-off are not the only ones keeping their money. The poorly-off and those in between are also doing it, to top up the low pensions they will be getting, for the purchase of consumer durables, for apartments. And they are the vast majority. And it would be unfair to change their money at a lower rate. And a simple revaluation (a 10:1 ratio, for example) would achieve nothing. It would be more expensive to refurbish the entire monetary edifice for the sake of the cash lying in money boxes.

Zhelnorova: Many people are very worried about price reform. When carrying it out is it possible to get by without increasing food prices?

Bunich: When agricultural production is switched to lease contracting and, instead of a vague tax in kind, one has to pay hard cash for a license, its effectiveness increases 2-10 times over. I believe that if this "works" on a wide scale, there will be so much food that prices will have to be reduced, not increased. Are there grounds for expecting a rapid increase in the number of lease, family, and other collectives? Important officials think not. Why, then, under the New Economic Policy, did such relationships assume the form of a chain reaction? Why did they create a food "explosion" in China? Because the obstacles were smashed. Our task is to fully implement the Law on the Cooperative system.

Zhelnorova: Some rather good laws are being adopted, but there is no monitoring of their fulfillment. Who punished the ministries which, instead of making enterprises happy, smothered them with state orders?

Bunich: We must considerably increase the role of the State Board of Arbitration. At the moment it is not accepting complaints about state orders. Is that just? Furthermore, there should be an economic court. This would essentially be a court of honor with announcements published in the central press. But the concept does not even exist in our country.

Zhelnorova: Economics are part and parcel of politics. In the absence of what changes in political institutions will the reform continue to struggle?

Bunich: It is necessary to eliminate arbitrary behavior by central bodies. At the moment their leaders are appointed "from on high," they will only answer to the "top people," and they will not stop ordering enterprises around. The solution is for those who appoint these leaders to be elected by the people. Then they will also be subject to democratic monitoring. And in the event of arbitrary behavior by central bodies' leaders the people will criticize and then recall the politicians who apppointed them. And I believe that a minister will not be a bureaucrat if he is not a deputy.

Zhelnorova: Do you expect big changes at the party conference?

Bunich: Despite many factors and conflicting currents, I do expect that, because it is reasonable and realistic. Otherwise, life is not interesting.

Agricultural

Kazakhstan Cancels Irrigation Projects

LD2406131988 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Alma-Ata June 24 TASS—The government of Kazakhstan has taken a decision to halt the construction of two irrigation projects on the slopes of Tien Shan, on the rivers Baskan and Bien in the basin of Lake Balkhash. This decision followed studies showing that the intake of water from these rivers to meet the needs of agriculture will cause a sharp drop in the level of 800-km Balkhash.

The decision to stop building the project was taken at the insistence of the Soviet of People's Deputies, a body of local state authority. It was preceded by the publication in Kazakhstan's press of numerous letters from scientists, writers and specialists. They warned that if no urgent measures were taken, Balkhash would turn into a chain of marshes already during the current generation. The giant lake helps significantly soften the climate in the region, populated by more than 2.5 million people. In the past ten years the level of water in the lake went down by 1.5 metres. The bed of the lake, which becomes more exposed, is the epicentre of dust and salt storms.

Scientists proposed measures to prevent the lake from drying up, including modernisation of irrigation systems, wide use of underground sources in agriculture and reducing the intake of water from the rivers flowing into it.

"Such probes are needed," Vera Sidorova, vice president of the Presidium of Kazakhstan's Supreme Soviet, told TASS. "They open before the population an opportunity to take part in solving the destiny of rivers, lakes and land, which various departments plan to use in their interests. The problems of scientific and technical progress must be considered only in the general context of social development."

Further on Nikonov, Zaykov Meeting on Produce

PM2806081188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "The Capital's Vegetable Supply"]

[Text] On 21 June L.N. Zaykov and V.P. Nikonov, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, visited enterprises in the capital engaged in storing and selling fruit and vegetable produce. They asked about the organization of the supply of vegetables and fruits to the population, the state of the material and technical base of the storage facilities, the utilization of refrigeration equipment, methods for delivering output to the stores, and ties with farms.

The following accompanied L.N. Zaykov and V.P. Nikonov: V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom; V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom; V.T. Saykin, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom; senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers; and Moscow and Moscow Oblast leaders.

A conference took place 22 June in the Moscow party gorkom to examine tasks in improving the supply of fruit and vegetable produce to the capital's population. It was noted that plans for deliveries to Moscow from the all-union stocks are not being fully implemented, output arrives spasmodically, the range is narrow, and in a number of cases there are deviations from the standards. Clear collaboration between Moscow Oblast farms and the capital's trade organizations has not been established. As a result the timetables for output deliveries from kolkhozes and sovkhozes are not always fulfilled, and there are instances of it being rejected by stores. Serious shortcomings were noted in the organization of trade.

With a view to a joint timely solution to the questions of getting fruit and vegetable produce from the fields to the stores, the Moscow Agro-Industrial Committee and the Moscow Oblast Agro-Industrial Committee were instructed to speedily arrange mutual ties and set up a joint center for managing deliveries. Corresponding instructions were give to the USSR Gosagroprom, USSR State Committee on Prices, Tsentrosoyuz, USSR Gossnab, USSR Ministry of Finance, USSR Ministry of Railways, and USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation.

L.N. Zaykov and V.P. Nikonov spoke at the conference.

Ligachev, Nikonov Attend Goods Exhibition

LD2506014688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Comrades Ligachev and Nikonov visited an exhibition of goods from subsidiary production facilities and trading organizations [promysl] attached to the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes. They now produce goods amounting to more than R25 billion. The output of this produce at farms is based, as a rule, on their own raw material resources. Food products, construction materials, various wooden goods, and fur clothing are in particular demand.

However, not all regions in the country are engaging in the development of subsidiary production facilities and trading organizations with the proper vigor. This concerns primarily the republics of the Trancaucasus and Central Asia. At the same time, the displays of separate cooperatives from Bulgaria, Hungary, the CSSR, and the GDR were looked at.

Reviewing the results of looking around the exhibition, Comrade Ligachev stressed the need for party, local soviet, and agro-industrial bodies to increase their attention to further developing subsidiary production facilities and trading organizations in farms. He noted that this ultimately promotes the setting up of stable collectives, a high level of employment in kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the acceleration of production of the main agricultural produce.

Taking part in the tour were Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; chairman of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee; Comrade Skiba, chief of the Agriculture and Food Industry Department of the CPSU Central Committee; and other senior members of staff of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus.

Nikonov Speaks at Agro-Industrial Committee

LD2406205388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] The Collegium of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee today discussed the matter of improving scientific provision for developing the agro-industrial complex. Comrade Nikonov, president of the Academy of Agricultural Sciences, noted in his report to the collegium that 18 scientific complexes serving individual sectors and 172 scientific production associations have been set up. This has made it possible to intensify the creation and introduction of scientific and technical developments to shorten the timescale for creating new equipment and technology. Hundreds of production and scientific-production systems have been organized for the accelerated introduction of scientific achievements into practical use. Comrade Nikonov stressed that such systems have already attained significant progress in the first year of their existence. The work of such systems is particularly noticeable in Kurgan, Rostov, Lipetsk, and Ternopol oblasts, as well as in the Stavropol region. Republican and oblast centers for making scientific provision for the agro- industrial complex have also been set up.

The first experience of work by scientific collectives on the principles of coordinated operations and financial autonomy has appeared. However, the dangerous tendency to reduce scientists' work to solving petty tasks has taken shape in this regard. In order to see the future prospects and to work on solving the major tasks of the food problem, Comrade Nikonov noted, it is necessary to take account of foreign experience in creating a centralized fund for the development of applied science. A significant increase in the general level of financing and a reinforcement of science with a modern material and technical base are also required.

The collegium noted that it is still necessary to solve many other problems connected with improving scientific provision for the development of the agro-industrial complex. Comrade Murakhovskiy and other orators spoke about this at the collegium session.

Further on Report to Collegium

LD2706141788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] The Collegium of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee has discussed the issue of boosting the development of the agro-industrial complex by better provision with scientific facilities. Thus, Comrade Nikonov, president of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, in his report to the collegium, noted that 18 branch scientific complexes and 172 scientific production associations had been created.

The organizational restructuring of agro-industrial science had made it possible to considerably speed up the creation and introduction of scientific and technical developments and to reduce the need for creating new plant and production processes. Hundreds of production and scientific production systems have been organized to speed up the utilization of scientific achievements. Comrade Nikonov stressed that in the first year of their existence, these sytems have attained considerable successes. Their operation is especially noticeable in Kurgan, Rostov, Lipetsk, and Ternopol Oblasts, and in Stavropol Kray, as well. Republic and oblast centers have been set up to provide the agro-industrial complex with scientific facilities.

The first experience has emerged of scientific collectives working according to the principles of economic cooperation and financial autonomy. In this connection, however, the dangerous tendency has been noted of making the work of scientists boil down to the solving of small tasks. In order to envisage the future, to resolve the major tasks of the foodstuffs problem, the president of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences noted, it was necessary to take into account experience gained abroad in creating a centralized stock of applied science. The general level of financing needs to be raised and science strengthened on a modern material and technical basis.

The collegium noted that many other problems connected with improving the development of the agro-industrial complex still have to be resolved by providing better scientific facilities. Comrade Murakhovskiy and other speakers spoke about this at the collegium session.

Scientific

Coordinates for Rocket Launches Announced

LD2506163688 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 25 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—In view of the completion of the planned launchings of booster rockets, TASS is authorised to state that the Pacific Ocean areas limited as follows:

By a rectangle the coordinates of the vertices of which are 30 degrees 30 minutes, northern latitude, and 170 degrees 10 minutes, eastern longitude, 30 degrees 45 minutes, northern latitude, and 171 degrees 30 minutes, eastern longitude, 23 degrees 00 minutes, northern latitude, 173 degrees 40 minutes, eastern longitude, 22 degrees 45 minutes, northern latitude, and 172 degrees 20 minutes, eastern longitude;

A rectangle the coordinates of the vertices of which are 18 degrees 00 minutes, northern latitude, and 173 degrees 10 minutes, eastern longitude, 18 degrees 30 minutes, northern latitude, and 175 degrees 20 minutes, eastern longitude, 16 degrees 40 minutes, northern latitude, and 175 degrees 40 minutes, eastern longitude, 16 degrees 10 minutes, northern latitude, and 173 degrees 30 minutes, eastern longitude;

By a circumference with a radius of 50 nautical miles with the centre the coordinates of which are 10 degrees 45 minutes, northern latitude, and 175 degrees 40 minutes, eastern longitude, which were announced on June 22, 1988, are free for navigation and flights of aircraft from June 26, 1988.

Soviet, Bulgarian Cosmonauts Presented Awards

Gromyko Gives Awards

LD2406114488 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko in the Kremlin today presented Soviet awards to members of the recent joint Soviet-Bulgarian space flight. Decorations were presented to the Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovev and Viktor Savinykh and to the Bulgarian researcher-cosmonauts Aleksandur Aleksandrov and Krasimir Stoyanov (backup).

When presenting the awards Andrey Gromyko said that the second joint Soviet-Bulgarian flight was carried out in the interests of enriching fundamental sciences and of the economies of the USSR and Bulgaria. The flight

programme was prepared by scientists of the two countries and included a big set of medico-biological, technological, geophysical and astrophysical experiments.

"There is no doubt that the information obtained by the cosmonauts during their work will make a big contribution to science and the economy of both countries and serve the further development of world cosmonautics", Andrey Gromyko said.

Speaking in reply, the cosmonauts expressed gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government.

Demichev in Attendance

LD2406202288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] In the Kremlin today, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko presented USSR state awards to Soviet and Bulgarian cosmonauts, participants in a joint international flight in near-Earth space. For successful implementation of a space flight on the "Mir" orbital science-research complex and for the courage and heroism revealed, the medals of the Gold Star and Order of Lenin have been presented to Solovev, Hero of the Soviet Union and USSR pilot-cosmonaut, and cosmonaut-researcher Aleksandrov, citizen of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and Hero of the Soviet Union; and the Order of Lenin to Savinykh, twice Hero of the Soviet Union and USSR pilot-cosmonaut. Cosmonaut-researcher Stoyanov, citizen of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, has received the Order of the Friendship of the Peoples for active participation in the work to ensure the space flight of the Soviet-Bulgarian crew on the Mir orbital science-research complex.

Comrade Gromyko made a speech during the awards ceremony. In particular he noted that the second joint Soviet-Bulgarian flight will be a significant contribution to science and the national economies of both countries and will serve the further development of world cosmonautics. Comrade Gromyko congratulated those awarded and passed cordial congratulations on to them from Mikhal Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The award recipients made reply speeches of thanks to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government. Their speeches were greeted with applause.

Comrades Demichev, Menteshashvili, Belousov, Biryukov, Kerimov, and Georgi Pankov, ambassador of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in the USSR, took part in handing over the awards.

Gromyko Speaks

LD2506114588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] In the Kremlin today the highest state awards of the Soviet Union were presented to those who took part in the joint Soviet-Bulgarian flight on board the "Mir" orbiting research complex. [passage omitted]

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko congratulated the members of the Soviet-Bulgarian crew on the successful completion of the flight program and on their being presented with the highest state awards of the Soviet Union. After conveying to the cosmonauts the cordial congratulations of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, Comrade Gromyko said:

[Begin Gromyko recording] Dear Comrades, in our time when space exploration is developing so rapidly every flight requires from its participants a wide range of interests, knowledge, genuine professional competence, courage, will-power, self-discipline, and determination. All these qualities were vividly displayed by Comrades Solovev, Savinykh, and Aleksandrov. These days were short yet, at the same time, long: short in comparison with other space flights, but long because you had the most concentrated schedule of all flights in orbit. The program of joint scientific research was carried out in accordance with the Shipka project. In history the name of that mountain pass came to be a symbol of our two countries' brotherhood in arms. Now it is the name of the program of fraternal Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space. This joint flight is further proof of our fraternity. I wish you happiness and great new successes in your noble endeavor. [applause] [end recording]

Analyst Reviews U.S.-USSR Space Cooperation

LD2306224588 Moscow TASS in English 1901 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 23 TASS—TASS political news analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

Soviet-American cooperation in the exploration and uses of outer space has been conducted virtually since the very beginning of the space age. Initially it had a form of contacts and exchanges of scientists and specialists, and since 1962 it was based on appropriate agreements between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of the USA.

The first intergovernmental agreement on cooperation in space was concluded in 1972. The Soyuz-Apollo joint space project was successfully implemented on the basis of that agreement in July 1975. The Soviet-American rendezvous in space was justly assessed as a concrete practical manifestation of the easing of international tension.

The new agreement between the USSR and the USA on cooperation in the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space was signed by USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz on April 15, 1987. The agreement envisages the development of bilateral cooperation in such areas of space science as the exploration of the solar

system, space astronomy and astrophysics, terrestrial science, solar-terrestrial physics, space biology and medicine. 16 concrete projects of cooperation include joint research to spot the most promising localities of landing on Mars, the exchange of scientific data on the studies of the venusian surface, space dust, meteorites and lunar rock, coordination of the activity under the Soviet projects "Phobos" and "Vesta", and the U.S. project "Mars-Observer", the exchange of data in the area of radio astronomy, coordination of work to study global changes of the environment, cooperation under the program of biosatellites of the Cosmos series and others.

The program of large-scale development of cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space advanced by the Soviet Union and submitted for the consideration of the international community in 1986 opens broad scope for interaction between the USSR and the USA. The Soviet program proceeds from the view that this cooperation serves the cause of peace, strengthening of confidence and mutual understanding among states. The USSR and the USA as states having the biggest space potential and experience in space activity undoubtedly play a special role. Interaction of the two countries in the solution of the question of the establishment of a world space organisation would be of particular importance. The creation of such an organisation would be a logical and necessary step commensurate with a qualitatively new and higher level of cooperation, specifically, with the tasks of the drafting and implementing large joint projects in various areas of cosmonautics.

The joint statement on the results of the recent Soviet-American summit in Moscow notes that peaceful exploration of outer space can make a serious contribution to the strengthening of the foundation of peaceful outer space. In his statement of January 15, 1986 Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized: We are deeply convinced that humanity should usher in the third millennium not by a program of "Star Wars" but by scopeful projects of peaceful uses of outer space by entire humanity.... This is one of the most important roads of ensuring progress on Earth and shaping a reliable system of security for all.

Activities Aboard 'Mir' Complex Reported

LD2406103488 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—A TASS correspondent reports from mission control centre:

Soviet cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are continuing preparations for work on the outer surface of the Mir orbital complex. Today they will check the functioning of the equipment in the station's transfer compartment that is used as a lock during exits into outer space and ready their space suits.

In accordance with their medical programme the two measured today their body weight and evaluated the state of their muscles which have a smaller work load in conditions of weightlessness than on earth. Tomorrow they will undergo an examination of their cardio-vascular system when fulfilling physical exercises.

In accordance with the international programme of experiments in extra-atmospheric astronomy studies are being continued with the use of the "Roentgen" orbital observatory. A new cycle of observations of a supernova in the large Magellanic cloud is being conducted today with the aim of getting information on the evolution of the spectrum of its emission.

Work on board the Mir orbital complex is proceeding according to schedule.

Dispute Between Leningrad, Academy Scientists

LD2706123988 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] An acute conflict has developed between the research center in Leningrad and the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The Leningrad scientists have accused the academy's leadership of holding back research because of their bureaucratic methods of management. The academy's Presidium held a special session in Leningrad. The city's researchers pointed out that they have no up-to-date instruments and equipment. Nevertheless, many of the talented scientists were able to produce works in thermonuclear fusion, electronics, physics, and other major branches of science, that of the world's highest level. The Leningraders demanded lifting the academy's bureaucratic restrictions, which among other things do not allow the researchers to earn foreign currency and spend it on improving scientific facilities.

New Cargo Delivery System to Arctic Developed

LD2406021088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1950 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] For the first time in history since the opening up of the northern Arctic Ocean, direct transportation of goods from Moscow to the North Pole has been carried out.

In addition to Il-76-MD pilots, also successfully taking part in the operation were parachutists from the (Ekspark) association attached to the aviation-technical sports club of the Moscow Aviation Institute. Polar researchers received 26 tonnes of cargo.

The direct flight to the North Pole took 10 hours and, most importantly, was many dozen times cheaper than the traditional method of transportation in which a single 300-liter barrel of solar oil costs R7,000.

Such technology involving parachute landing cargoes is unparalleled. The unprecedented experiment carried out by the sport parachutists—all 24 members of (Ekspark)

have been given the Master of Sports title—opens up immense opportunities for delivering cargo not only to drifting stations but to remote islands as well.

Indeed, in the spring of 1987 (Ekspark) rescued people on the islands of Vize and Uyedinyeniye whom ice breakers could not reach for the whole season.

A special service is now being set up in the Institute of the Arctic and Antarctic that will handle parachute delivery of cargo for polar workers.

Baklanov Views Developments in Aviation

PM2706150188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "New Equipment for Aeroflot"]

[Text] On 21 June O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited the flight testing center in Zhukovskiy, a city in the Moscow region, where he saw progress in the work of developing a new medium-haul passenger airplane, the Tu-204. The aircraft builders' attention was drawn to the need to take additional measures to ensure that the 1990 deadline set by the Ministry of Civil Aviation for the aircraft's commissioning is met without fail.

O.D. Baklanov also acquainted himself with the tests being carried out on the Tu-155 passenger airliner, whose engine installation runs on liquid hydrogen, and with work into the use of natural gas as an aviation fuel. Ways of further developing these progressive areas were discussed.

O.D. Baklanov was accompanied by I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and O.S. Belyakov, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department.

Military

Yazov Remarks to Conference Delegates Reported

PM2806105188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 88 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting With Party Conference Delegates"]

[Text] A meeting took place in Moscow on 27 June between Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and Army and Navy delegates to the 19th all-union party conference.

Army General D.T. Yazov warmly congratulated those present on their election as delegates to the party conference. He urged Communists to actively implement party policy in the Armed Forces, be the standard bearers of restructuring, and boldly take up and persistently put into practice everything new and progressive born in the course of combat training and Army and Navy life, and wished them success in the conference.

Stalin's 'Gross' Wartime Errors Detailed

PM2406082988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Jun 88 First Edition p 2

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor Colonel V. Anfilov, retired: "The Beginning...An Historian Answers Readers' Questions"; first two paragraphs are KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] The date—22 June 1941. War!... It burst into our homes like a black herald of grief and touched every Soviet family with its sinister fiery wing. Even today, 47 years later, we are agonizingly seeking answers to bitter questions that tear at the soul and the memory: "Why was the start of the Great Patriotic War so unsuccessful for us? What can account for our troops' heavy defeats and great losses? Could the enemy have been greeted differently, in a state of greater readiness?"

Both frontline soldiers and those who know of the war only from books, movies, and the stories of its participants ask about this in their letters to the editorial office. We asked Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor Viktor Aleksandrovich Anfilov to answer the questions which are encountered most frequently.

I will begin with what, in my view, is the chief point. The start of the Great Patriotic War was tragic and extremely grave for our people, above all, because of the very gross mistakes and miscalculations made by I.V. Stalin and his entourage. These miscalculations were made in the analysis of the military-political situation on the continent—relations with fascist Germany above all—and also in the adoption of very important decisions in the prewar years, including the first half of 1941. Yes, our enemy was perfidious and strong. Even if the strategic situation and the development of events in Europe and the world had been accurately assessed and all the state's forces had been mobilized to the utmost and in good time to rebuff the aggressor, the war would have been hard for the Soviet Union. But a great deal could undoubtedly have been avoided. Stalin's erroneous concepts and criminal actions essentially made it impossible to make practical preparations for battles, particularly in the border zone, fettered the independence of command personnel, and misled the people's broad masses.

Approximately 40,000 commanders, political workers, military engineers, and other Army and Navy specialists were subjected to repression during the prewar years. The figure attests to the mass nature of cadre losses on the eve of a grim war. And it was the best, most highly trained and tempered people who were removed from combat commission. Those losses were irreplaceable. If you consider the fact that on the eve of the war our

Armed Forces had more than trebled in size and reached a strength of 5 million men, the shortage of experienced commanders in all echelons of management threatened future disasters.

Although military schools worked with growing intensity, they could not make good the losses in a short space of time.

"The last check carried out by the inspector of infantry," Lieutenant General V. Kurdyumov, chief of the Combat Training Directorate, said at a conference in December 1940, "showed that of the 225 regimental commanders called to assembly just 25 were graduates of military schools, while the other 200 were people who had graduated from junior lieutenant courses or come from the reserve."

Stalin personally made unforgivable mistakes in determining the aggressor's chief strike in a future war. He believed, contrary to intelligence data, that that strike would be aimed at the southwest, at the Ukraine. Stalin demanded that our chief forces be stationed precisely there at the expense of a substantial weakening of the western sector [napravleniye].

Many readers are interested in the origins of Stalin's grossest miscalculations during the prewar years and days. Even today, when increasingly broad access is being opened up to the documents of that time, some people are inclined to reduce everything to supposedly inefficient work by our military intelligence. That is false. I believe that it is hardly possible to make serious complaints about intelligence with regard to exposing the aggressor's design.

Stalin simply did not inform the General Staff of some extremely important reports. I was told this in 1965 by Marshal of the Soviet Union G. Zhukov, when he saw for the first time, so he said, in the manuscript of my book a report from Lieutenant General F. Golikov, chief of the Main Intelligence Directorate, to Stalin dated 20 March 1941. It was this that set forth the probable plans for a German Army invasion of the USSR and its timing. Incidentally, in that same report the intelligence directorate chief himself casts doubt on the authenticity of that information. Such was the general atmosphere at that time, which made many people fall in with Stalin's opinion.

There was every reason for our side to take measures, but the political leadership did not draw proper conclusions and essentially ignored intelligence information. On 7 June the German ambassador to Moscow reported to Berlin: "All observations confirm that Stalin and Molotov, who alone are responsible for Russian foreign policy, are doing everything to avoid conflict with Germany."

Stalin rigorously demanded that the political leadership not provide any grounds for a provocation. And the people's commissar for defense and the chief of the General Staff forwarded those demands to the troops. On 10 June 1941 Zhukov telegraphed the Military Council of Kiev Special Military District: "For a report to the people's commissar informing me on what grounds units of fortified areas of Kiev Special Military District received an order to occupy the forward defense area. Such an action could at once provoke the Germans into an armed confrontation and this is fraught with all sorts of consequences. Rescind that order immediately and report who specifically issued such an arbitrary order." On the same day a telegram was sent to border districts: "The people's commissar for defense has ordered that the forward defense area not be occupied by field and fortified area units without special instructions to do so." But the troops did not receive those "special instructions" until the start of the enemy invasion.

With the "help," chiefly, of Stalin, who did not give permission for the troops to be put in a state of complete combat readiness until late in the evening of 21 June, the fascist command managed to achieve surprise—which was what Hitler and his generals were counting on. A pernicious role was also played by a TASS report of 14 June, which denied rumors of the possibility of a war between the Soviet Union and Germany. Not knowing the true reasons for its appearance, many Soviet people, including military people, received that report with a sigh of relief and concluded that there could be no war in the very near future.

So there is good reason to maintain today that fascist Germany's attack on the USSR was "perfidious and sudden" only because of Stalin's maniacal confidence that it would be possible to avoid war and that there would be no confrontation on terms disadvantageous to us. In him the politician's natural caution developed into overcautiousness which fettered everyone who could sense the approaching mortal danger.

The start of the war came as a surprise even to a considerable section of the military.

As one of a group of students of the Military Engineering Academy, I was then doing practical work on the staff of Kiev Special Military District. We were living in the barracks of an air base in the outskirts of Kiev. The airfield was one of the first to be subjected to enemy bombardment at dawn on 22 June. We thought that maneuvers had begun, as mentioned in a TASS report. Only the sound of breaking windows, the cries of the injured, and the burning hangars and aircraft "brought us to our senses." But was it only us...?

Knowing our airfields, the enemy calculatingly destroyed hundreds of our aircraft—fighters above all—and essentially secured mastery of the skies on the very first day; he destroyed centers and lines of communication, disrupting troop control; he destroyed a large number of tanks and artillery pieces....

The situation was exacerbated by an acute shortage and even a lack of ammunition and fuel. "As a result of the first day of combat operations," General P. Belov, chief of the Northwest Front's Artillery Directorate, reported to Marshal G. Kulik at 0600 on 23 June, "there is an acute shortage of...37mm and 85mm antiaircraft rounds—the materiel of these calibers is inoperative (and this under conditions of "absolute enemy mastery of the skies")—76mm regimental shells, 122mm and 152mm shells, hand grenades, and large-caliber rounds. Please issue instructions for urgent dispatch."

It was extremely difficult to fulfill both this and many other requests from commanders, as the combat rear services organs had not been deployed and mobilized and a large part of our strategic stocks had been destroyed or captured by the enemy.

And yet the initial correlation of forces, as readers rightly point out, had been more advantageous to us—from a purely statistical viewpoint. It is known, Comrades I. Krasnov and D. Golin report, that there were approximately 1,100 tanks in the enemy's 1st Tank Group, while Kiev Special Military District had almost 5,000. So why did the counterstrikes by Southwest Front mechanized corps in the regions of Lutsk, Rovno, Dubno, and Brody not produce the necessary result?

It must be borne in mind that the overwhelming majority of tanks were of obsolete types (T-26 and BT), with thin armor plating and an average range of 75-100 driving hours. New types of tanks had begun to reach the troops in the last months and even days before the invasion and had not been mastered by the crews.

And yet the single fact that the hardware was old cannot account for the huge losses. We know that at the start of the war the Hitlerites had also used many tanks of obsolete designs, with poor combat qualities. During the tragic days of June and July we were frequently let down by unskilled use of existing resources. In the fall of 1941, near Moscow, even old tanks inflicted serious damage on the enemy alongside T-34's.

The trouble was that right at the start of the war our tank formations waged battle without air cover, without cooperating with infantry and artillery, and without effective intelligence. There were also simply bizarre situations. On 23 June the 37th Tank Division of the 15th Mechanized Corps, which had more than 300 tanks, received a combat mission from General I. Karpezo, corps commander, to go into the Adamy region and destroy approximately 100 German tanks concentrated there. When the tankmen arrived at the said spot 5-6 hours later, they discovered that there was no enemy there. Unfortunately, there were many such miscalculations in troop control during the first, the hardest, days of the war.

On receiving my assignment to the Army in the field, I arrived in Lvov on the morning of 24 June and witnessed a gathering of a huge number of our tanks in the city's narrow streets. German aircraft struck faultlessly at the "jams" caused by tanks moving in opposite directions. Many machines were set on fire by enemy saboteurs ensconced on roofs and in the attics of buildings. "Failure to observe elementary regulation norms in the organization of marches," General D. Ryabyshev, commander of the 8th Mechanized Corps, reported, "was the chief reason for the loss of the combat ability of combat materiel."

On 15 July, according to a directive letter from the Supreme Command General Headquarters, the mechanized corps were disbanded as being "cumbersome, not very mobile, and not adapted for maneuvering." In fact, by then they had suffered great losses and lost their combat ability....

There are many questions about Stalin's place and role right at the start of the war. I think the report of the German fascist army's invasion really shook Stalin. It was such a blow to faith in his wisdom and infallibility! He did not consent to address the people over the radio on the occasion of fascist Germany's attack. The next morning he also refused the post of chairman of the Main Command General Headquarters.

In general, the impression is created that the consequences of the Wehrmacht's first strikes were not at once assessed even by the front staffs. Reports of courage and heroism (which really was the case on all the fronts) and assurances to "rout, smash, and destroy" predominated in the first dispatches from the fronts. Receiving dispatches and operations reports which did not reflect the actual state of affairs at the front, the people's commissar for defense and the chief of the General Staff were not able to assess the situation correctly. This alone can account for the issuing of the Main Military Council's directive in the evening of 22 June to rout the invading aggressor and to switch the troops of the Southwest Front to a counteroffensive in the Lublin sector.

Nor did Stalin have a correct picture of the situation at the fronts. Only after receiving a report on the capture of Minsk by the Germans 28 June did he finally realize the gravity of the situation in which the Army and the country found themselves. "Alarmed by this course of things," A.I. Mikoyan recalled, "Stalin suggested that we all drive to the USSR People's Commissariat for Defense and investigate the situation on the spot. G.K. Zhukov, N.F. Vatutin, and several other generals and officers of the General Staff found themselves in S.K. Timoshenko's study. A very stern conversation took place there. Only at that moment did Stalin really realize the entire seriousness of the miscalculations in assessing the possibility, timing, and consequences of Hitlerite Germany's attack."

On 30 June a special organ of supreme power in the country in wartime—the State Defense Committee—was set up. Stalin became its chairman. From that moment life itself made him comprehend that element without which competent leadership of a country at war and of a fighting party was impossible.

No, our people will never forget the upheavals of 1941. The greatness of this hero-people consists in the fact that they proved ready even for such a trial, withstood a blow of unprecedented force, defeated the plans for a "Blitzkrieg," and began creating the foundations of the future victory as early as those bitter June days.